1992

# Principal performance evaluation: a nationwide status report on the type and effectiveness of evaluation as perceived by principals and supervisors

Ruth A. Frerking
*Iowa State University*

# INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.** Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9311489

# Principal performance evaluation: A nationwide status report on the type and effectiveness of evaluation as perceived by principals and supervisors

Frerking, Ruth A., Ph.D.

Iowa State University, 1992

U·M·I

300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

# Principal performance evaluation: A nationwide status report on the type and effectiveness of evaluation as perceived by principals and supervisors

by

Ruth A. Frerking

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies in Education
Major: Education (Educational Administration)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Education Major

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1992

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF TABLES

# CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Recent research and reform directed toward the improvement of the nation's educational system has focused on the school as the primary unit of change, and the principal of the school as a change agent. The resulting definition of the principal as the key to school improvement has led to a proliferation of research concerning the identification of characteristics of principals who have demonstrated successful instructional leadership in effective schools (Blumburg, 1986; Burns, 1978; Duke, 1990; Dwyer, 1985; Etzioni, 1988; Hall & Hord, 1987; Louis & Miles, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1991; Smith & Andrews, 1988; Vaill, 1984), and of preservice and inservice programs best suited to provide skills and knowledge required for the development of this type of leadership (Barnett, 1987; Barth, 1990; Daresh & LaPlant, 1984; Murphy & Hallinger, 1987). The emerging expectation has been that principals trained in effective instructional leadership strategies will guide their schools through planned improvement programs that result in increased student achievement and other desirable outcomes (Barth, 1990; Dwyer, 1986; Fullan, 1991; Hall, 1988; Hord, 1990; Murphy & Hallinger, 1987; Van der Vegt & Knit, 1988).

Significant progress has been made toward the development of criteria that can be used to identify effective principals (AASA, 1983; Blumburg & Greenfield, 1980; Hoyle, English, & Steffy, 1985; Manatt, 1988; Pitner, 1987) and toward the identification of training components that effectively enable principals-in-training and practicing principals to

develop skills and knowledge needed to meet these criteria (Hoyle, English, & Steffy, 1985; Pitner, 1987; Silver, 1987). The degree to which these components are effectively implemented into principal training programs will significantly impact the success of principals in their efforts to facilitate school improvement (Barnett, 1987; Barth, 1990; Duke & Stiggens, 1985; Duke, 1990; Hord, Hall, Leithwood, & Hantzi, 1990; Levine, 1987; Lortie, 1975). While improved training programs enable administrators to develop the skills needed to lead tomorrow's schools, they are unable to ensure these skills are being successfully implemented by practicing principals. An effective system of performance evaluation is needed to offer this assurance.

Focus on the principal as the key to successful schools and an increasing demand from the public that schools be held accountable has led to renewed interest on the part of state legislators in principal performance evaluation (Peters & Bagenstos, 1988). During the reform era of the '80s, most state legislatures mandated or planned to mandate some form of principal evaluation. Peters and Bagenstos (1988) found the mandates addressing principal evaluation to vary among states; all included one or more of the following: 1) the requirement that an evaluation system be established, 2) guidelines for the development and/or implementation of an evaluation instrument and/or system of evaluation, 3) the requirement that a district instrument and/or evaluation system be approved by the state, or 4) the requirement that a state-developed instrument and/or system of evaluation be implemented. A weakness of much

of this legislation was the failure to establish a means of ensuring compliance.

Simultaneously, models for the evaluation of principal performance that would enable schools to meet the requirements of these mandates were being developed by experts in the field. Each of these models offered unique features, but strands of similarity reflected research on effective supervision. Most current models combined both formative and summative evaluation within a single program. Attention to system-wide evaluation was recommended to ensure that principal evaluation would be conducted in a supportive environment. Planning for evaluation, collecting information, and using information were phases identified by Bolton (1980) and incorporated with some revision into most models. The inclusion of stakeholders in the initial planning of the system was recommended to increase ownership. Clear expectations were identified as essential for an effective system, including valid, reliable, and discriminating criteria. Setting goals and objectives that support building and district goals were included to increase commitment and ensure that principal evaluation contributed to district improvement.

Data collection strategies were expanded to include portfolios, and consideration was given to parent, student, and teacher input when appropriate. This increased credibility and helped to eliminate bias. Scheduled and unscheduled site visits, including shadowing, coaching, and conferences, allowed supervisors to make valid judgments concerning performance and to assist principals in improving that performance. The number of conferences between evaluators and principals was increased to

provide feedback and build trust and commitment. Supported by effective district staff development, growth plans based on feedback, and school and district goals were included to provide the necessary connection between principal evaluation and school improvement (Bolton, 1980; Duke & Stiggens, 1985; Ginsberg, 1989; Manatt, 1988; Smith & Andrews, 1988; Valentine, 1987).

Despite this increase in attention to the evaluation of principals, little research of value has been directed toward the critical analysis of instruments and evaluation systems that were developed and implemented during the past decade (Ginsberg, 1989). In a recent comprehensive review, Ginsberg found that literature concerning principal evaluation consisted of reports on local practices, personal opinions about the correct way to evaluate principals, and guidelines for establishing a district evaluation system. Little empirical evidence was found to establish the effectiveness of the systems that were recommended. In addition, Ginsberg found that, although some progress was made toward improvement of principal evaluation, the models which had been developed and the practices supported by research did not appear to be widely used in school districts across the nation. These findings hold critical significance for educators committed to school improvement. Until a substantial research base has been established that deals with principal evaluation and research-based models and practices have been widely implemented, reform issues cannot be effectively addressed.

Research and implementation of principal evaluation have been further complicated by a second wave of reform, calling for total organizational

restructuring of school districts with new implications for the role of principal. Many districts were in the process of implementing and refining new models of principal evaluation built on the premise that the principal was instructional leader of the building and clinical evaluation was an effective method of developing this leadership when they were presented with new expectations for organizational structures. These new structures depended heavily on the principal as a key link within the district organization (Fullan, 1991).

In addition to issues of organizational structure, increasing attention and priority have been given to concerns for educational quality and equity. If the principal is, as research has indicated, the key to successful school improvement, it follows that the degree to which the quality of education can be ensured for all children within a district will be significantly impacted by the degree to which the performance of principals can be effectively evaluated. Equally critical is the charge that quality educational opportunity be made available to all children in the schools of our nation, regardless of the school district or state in which they reside (Goodlad & Oakes, 1988; Hilliard, 1991; Hodgkinson, 1988). Without systems that effectively evaluate the performance of all principals within a district, within a state, and throughout the country, it will be difficult to guarantee this equity.

## Statement of the Problem

The problem of this investigation was to determine the status of principal evaluation in the United States and to study the relationship

between the characteristics of school and district, the type and conditions of evaluation systems, and the effectiveness of the system as perceived by the principals and supervisors.

## Purpose

A strong research base has been established to support the contribution of the principal to the effectiveness of schools, the skills needed to provide the leadership required of principals, and the type of training that will develop these skills. Although most states have mandated that the performance of principals be evaluated in order to ensure that effective leadership is being provided to schools, little research has been conducted to establish the extent to which these mandates have been followed, the type of evaluation systems that have been implemented under these mandates, or to evaluate the effectiveness of these systems. Therefore, it was the intention of this study to:

1. Determine to what extent principals are being evaluated in the United States.
2. Determine which types of evaluation are being used and under what conditions.
3. Determine the effectiveness of these evaluation systems as perceived by principals and supervisors.
4. Determine the relationship, if any, among characteristics of schools, types and conditions of evaluation systems, and the perceived effectiveness of these systems.

5. Contribute information that will help assess the ability of existing systems to support effective leadership within the school and district needed to provide quality education to all students.

## Objectives

The overarching objective of the study is to provide information concerning the status of evaluation practices used in school districts within the United States as represented by the sample and to assess the effectiveness of principal evaluation systems used in these districts as perceived by supervisors and principals. Specific objectives include:

1. To develop a valid survey instrument that will provide accurate information concerning the status of performance evaluation of principals in sample districts and the perceived effectiveness of evaluation systems used in these districts.
2. To collect and categorize data from public schools across the nation concerning types of principal evaluation in use, conditions of evaluation, agreement of participants concerning type and conditions of evaluation, and characteristics of schools using different evaluation systems.
3. To report the degree to which supervisors and principals perceive their principal evaluation system is effective.
4. To determine relationships between characteristics of schools, type of evaluation, conditions of evaluation, and the effectiveness of the evaluation.

5. To report findings and further research questions suggested by the conclusions drawn from the collected data.

## Research Questions and Hypotheses

The following research questions and hypotheses were addressed:

1. Planning, data gathering, and data analysis are recommended in leading models of principal evaluation and contribute to their effectiveness. Also contributing to effectiveness are the use of goals which tie the evaluation system to building and district objectives, and clinical components which allow for professional growth and accountability.
   a. What relationship, if any, exists between the effectiveness of the district's system of principal evaluation and the type of system in use?
   b. No relationship exists between the effectiveness of the district's system of principal evaluation and the type of system in use.
2. Experience, training, span of control, and merit pay all impact the effectiveness of an evaluation system.
   a. What relationship, if any, exists between the effectiveness of the district's system of principal evaluation and the conditions under which the system is employed?
   b. No relationship exists between the effectiveness of the district's system of principal evaluation and the conditions under which the system is employed.

3. Size and socioeconomic status impact the time, money, and expectations that a district brings to its evaluation program.
   a. What relationship, if any, exists between the effectiveness, type and conditions of the district's system of principal evaluation, and the demographics of the school and district?
   b. No relationship exists between the effectiveness, type and conditions of the district's system of principal evaluation, and the demographics of the school and district.

## Assumptions

This study was based on the following assumptions:

1. Persons completing the survey were knowledgeable concerning the principal evaluation system of the district.
2. Districts responding to the survey were representative of a sample which will be used to estimate the national population.
3. Respondents would provide complete and accurate information.
4. Evaluation of principals was essential to effective schools.

## Delimitations

This study is limited by the following:

1. This sample provided for three questionnaires to be mailed to each of 682 public school districts in the United States.
2. Respondents to the questionnaire for this study were one evaluator of principals, one high school principal, and one elementary principal from each district.

3. This study was limited to a stratified, nonproportional, and randomly selected school district sample representing the predescribed national population.
4. The population from which the random sample was drawn includes districts with 20 or more teachers.
5. States which had mandated a state-developed instrument for teacher evaluation at the time the sample was drawn were not included.
6. Results of this investigation represent the 1991/92 school year, during which the data were collected.
7. The district sampling was based on data gathered in the Common Core of Data (CCD) surveys collected March 1988 by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES).

## Definition of Terms

Accountability: Responsible for specific performance, cost, or outcome.

Evaluator: Person responsible for conducting formal, mandatory evaluation.

Formative Evaluation: Ongoing supervision that includes observation, documentation, conferencing, and data gathering for the purpose of fostering growth.

Summative Evaluation: Composite of all information collected, which serves as a basis for decision making.

Supervisor: Administrator that holds the responsibility for supervising and evaluating principals.

# CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Efforts to reform our nation's schools to meet the needs of the 21st century began with "A Nation at Risk" and have evolved through several phases. The result has been an emerging belief that the solution to the inadequacies of our educational system lies in the total restructuring of our schools. As educators and researchers apply themselves to the task of determining the form this restructuring should take, questions have risen concerning the position of the principal within restructured school districts. Among these questions are the following which have guided this review of literature: What does a productive school district that meets the needs of today's students look like? What is the role of the principal in this organization? How can school districts effectively evaluate the success of principals in fulfilling this role?

During the past decade, unprecedented attention has been given to the role of principal. Early efforts of school reforms that dominated the '80s focused on improvement of teaching and the responsibility of principals to lead instruction within the building. Principals were viewed by many researchers as the key to effective schools. In an attempt to hold principals accountable, state reform legislation mandated that school districts evaluate principals. A result of this legislation was increased interest in the development of principal evaluation models that could be adapted by districts to ensure accountability and to facilitate professional growth. Even as these new models were being placed into school districts throughout the country, the organizations they were

designed to serve were undergoing in-depth study with the intent to change.

This study was greatly influenced by the attempts of business and industry to restructure into more productive organizations. In an effort to regain leadership in domestic and world markets, organizational research focused on factors that contributed to the success of highly effective companies. Educational theorists and reformers were influenced by, and contributed to, the ensuing body of knowledge. The result has been a second wave of educational reform concerned with the limitations that existing organizational structures place on effective teaching and learning. This new wave of reform calls for nothing less than total restructuring of our schools and will significantly impact the role of principals and the relationship they share with their supervisors. An examination of these roles and relationships, as suggested by recent organizational research, raises the question of the ability of current practices of principal evaluation to support new organizational paradigms. The following review of literature attempts to define these paradigms through an examination of theories of organizational culture and change and to determine the roles they indicate for principals and their supervisors in restructured schools. Literature dealing with evaluation of principals is also addressed to determine the ability of current principal evaluation models to support new organizational structures and processes.

## Cultures of Productive Organizations

Organizational culture, a concept addressed by Mayo, Barnard, and others in the '30s and '40s has recaptured the interest of corporate and educational leaders. Schein (1985) defined culture as

> ...the deeper level of basic assumptions and beliefs that are shared by members of an organization, that operate unconsciously, and that define in a "taken for granted" fashion an organization's view of itself and its environment. (p. 6)

The ability to establish and maintain a culture supportive of organizational visions and goals has been identified as a key ingredient to productivity. As a result, researchers and reformers in the public and private sector have shown great interest in the cultures of successful organizations.

During the '80s, organizational researchers identified characteristics that allowed companies to improve their productivity and increase their market share when other businesses were in decline. Educational theorists drew from and added to the resulting body of knowledge in an attempt to provide answers for the problems facing the nation's schools. Emerging from this research, a paradigm of organizational culture has been defined that supports quality and productivity in corporations and other organizations, including school districts. This paradigm holds significant implications for the role of the principal if a strong productive culture is to be maintained.

The following profile, drawing from the work of Bennis (1989), Deming (1986), Peters and Waterman (1982), and Senge (1991), outlines the characteristics found in productive organizations and helps to define the new paradigm of organizational culture. A clear vision is shared by

members of these organizations, defining what the organization seeks to become, channeling action into a unified direction, and providing a guide for sound decisions. A climate of trust permeates the organization, based on respect for the value and expertise of each member. Continuous learning is highly valued and together with continuous teaching is found at all organizational levels. A universal concern for quality impacts decisions and workmanship throughout the organization. Collaboration and teamwork are used at all levels of the organization to increase input and build a greater sense of ownership and commitment. Entrepreneurial risk taking is encouraged to stimulate ideas and increase the creative energy of the organization. Systems thinking permeates the organization, ensuring that both short- and long-term consequences are considered and that interconnectedness of all units is addressed. Over time, these characteristics become highly valued within the organization, and belief in their effectiveness results in a strong culture supportive of productivity, commitment, and quality. These values and beliefs are translated into behavioral norms that guide the operations, decisions, and direction of the organization.

The paradigm created by these characteristics of productive culture increases in complexity when applied to school districts, where organizational culture exists at two levels--the district and the building. Organizational structure is loose at both levels, caused in part by the isolation of separate buildings, separate classrooms, and by the broad discretionary power granted to teachers and principals in meeting the needs of their students (Weick, 1976). This looseness

increases the importance of developing a strong culture at both levels with values and beliefs that tighten the organization into a productive unit. Cultural development of this type requires commitment and skill on the part of principals and their supervisors, and carries implications for the roles of each if this culture is to be strengthened and maintained.

The supervisor of principals, whether superintendent or central office administrator, serves as a model for interpretation and dissemination of district values and beliefs (Hord, 1990). To accomplish this successfully requires frequent contact between principals and supervisors. The principal, in turn, provides the supervisor with feedback concerning the health of the district culture within his/her building.

Principals play a dual role within the district. The first role involves development and dissemination of district culture. In this role, principals participate in the shaping of the district culture and serve as key transmitters and interpreters of that culture within their building. If they are to effectively disseminate the culture of the district and enlist enrollment of teachers, it is critical that principals have a strong commitment to that culture. This commitment is strengthened if the principal is involved as a key player in collegiality and team planning at the district level (Hord, 1992). The principal, in turn, serves as the on-site model for teachers and staff, translating the beliefs and values of the district into daily action and strengthening the district culture by supporting and rewarding appropriate behavior.

Equally important is the role of the principal in developing and maintaining a strong culture within his/her building. As such, it is the responsibility of each principal to establish a complementary, yet individual culture within his/her building (Sergiovanni, 1991). The characteristics of this culture are the same as those of the district, yet they must be developed to suit unique needs and personality of each building within the district if they are to increase productivity. The principal, then, is the key transmitter of district culture at the building level, and developer and sustainer of a separate but complementary building culture. As such, the principal is an essential contributor to the productivity of the district, ensuring that district and building culture translate to effective learning and achievement in the classroom.

In summary, a strong culture that embraces shared vision, trust, continuous learning, concern for quality, collaboration, risk taking, and systems thinking is needed at the building and the district level if a high level of productivity is to be maintained. Principals are in a position to determine the success of developing, strengthening, and maintaining this type of culture within the district. If a strong, productive culture is to permeate the district and impact teaching and learning within the classroom, contact between supervisor and principal must be frequent, allowing for modeling and monitoring of the culture. In addition, a high degree of commitment on the part of the principal to the district culture is necessary if this culture is to have any effect in individual classrooms. This commitment cannot be handed down to the

principal from the central office. Rather, it is a product of ownership, which develops as a result of principal participation in district level activities designed to build culture through the clarification of values and beliefs and the development of a shared vision.

## Cultures Supporting Continuous Change and Implementation

If the culture of a school district is to remain productive over time, it must be able to support change. The accelerated pace of today's society underscores the need for organizations, including school districts, to engage in continuous change if they are to be effective (Fullan, 1991). Two dimensions of change must be addressed by educators seeking to impact teaching and learning within the district. In the narrow sense, change refers to the implementation of an individual innovation. In a broader sense, it refers to the continual process within an organization of both micro and macro adjustments to existing programs. Districts must be prepared to handle both dimensions of change. The result is a dynamic organization in which no program is seen as permanently defined or permanently in place. Rather, programs are continuously monitored, adjusted, and, when necessary, replaced to ensure the needs of the students and the goals of the district are being met. Likewise, new innovations are not merely added to existing programs, but carefully and continuously integrated with and adjusted to those programs.

If school improvement is to occur, districts must build the capacity to support continuous change as well as the successful implementation of specific programs (LaRocque & Coleman, 1989). Based on Fullan's review of

the work of several researchers (Fullan, Bennett, & Rolheiser-Bennett, 1990; LaRocque & Coleman, 1989; Louis, 1989; Rosenholtz, 1989), the following profile describes a school that successfully sustains ongoing adaptation, evaluation, and adjustment:

1. A system is in place to weigh the value of innovations and their ability to contribute to the desired outcomes of the organization, resisting the pressure placed on schools today to engage in change merely to create the appearance of improvement.

2. A combination of top-down and bottom-up approach to change is employed which combines the strength of ownership and efficiency at the building level with coordination and resources at the district level and accomplishes more than either approach could individually.

3. The expectation of continuous learning is held for all staff and administrators in coordination with district and school improvement goals, and support for this learning is built into the school system.

4. Collaborative planning and support through the use of vertical and horizontal teams is built into all operations of the district, ensuring continuous commitment and coordination throughout the organization.

5. An effective two-way communication system permeates the district and allows for continuous horizontal and vertical contact, and formal and informal dialogue. This communication is not left to chance.

6. Continuous positive monitoring and evaluation of organizational processes and outcomes are built into the system and impacts program decisions and budget allocations.

Districts that closely approximate the profile outlined in these six steps are organizations in which members continually monitor programs that are in place to determine needed adjustment, are alert to needs that are not being met, and are ready to take on the implementation of new programs. This profile holds strong implications concerning the roles of principals and supervisors and the type of relationship needed if continuous change is to be supported.

If this readiness is to be sustained, frequent contact between supervisor and principal is necessary. The contact must be on task, addressing goals identified by the district, programs already in place, and needs that have developed. If it is to be effective, contact must also be reciprocal, respecting the expertise of both parties and their ability to provide pertinent information to the exchange. Again, this type of frequent, reciprocal, on-task contact will be of limited value if the person is not highly committed to the programs being monitored and the process used to monitor them.

In addition to processes that sustain readiness for change, researchers have investigated those that support implementation of specific innovations. Successful implementation and maintenance of innovations are found in schools where the following occurs: 1) staff development addresses values and beliefs as well as behaviors and establishes teams who provide ongoing support; 2) support and pressure from the central office are continuously applied and carefully balanced throughout implementation; 3) communication includes frequent engagement between the central office and schools, and allows for the development of

a strong mutual presence at both district and building level; 4) new relationships are established that support implementation, and roles and responsibility are clearly defined, based on expertise and a commitment to collaboration; and 5) a system of accountability allows for continuous monitoring and adjustment of programs during and following implementation.

The literature indicates that the successful implementation of specific innovations impacts the roles of both supervisor and the principal. Again, the need for frequent contact is apparent. If the contact is reciprocal in nature, the innovation can be more effectively monitored, as information and ideas are exchanged in both directions. The expertise that both parties bring to this exchange allows for adjustments to the implementation plan before costly mistakes are made. Contact that is on task will focus attention on the innovation and increase the speed of adjustment and success. Commitment on the part of the principal is necessary if the building staff is to go beyond the motions of implementation and impact the learning within the classroom (Fullan, 1991).

In summary, the nature and characteristics of change must be understood if a district is to be productive, i.e., capable of sustaining effective teaching and learning within each classroom. This understanding requires that two aspects of change be addressed.

1. The district's ability to sustain continuous monitoring and adjustment of current programs and practices based on input from all levels of the organization concerning the effectiveness and efficiency of these programs.

2. The ability to develop, implement, integrate, and sustain innovations which contribute significantly to the total mission of the district.

As with the maintenance of productive culture, the building and maintenance of a dynamic organization prepared to handle continuous change requires contact between the supervisor and principal and commitment on the part of both. If teaching and learning are to be impacted at the classroom level, three aspects of supervisor/principal contact must be addressed.

1. Contact must be frequent. The sustained effectiveness of programs in place and innovations being implemented require continuous monitoring and adjustment, which, in turn, require a highly effective system of communication within the district. The positions of the supervisor and the principal within the organization allow each the potential to become a key link to effective district-wide communication. If they are to operate effectively in this role and contribute significantly to the productivity of the organization, frequent contact is needed between supervisors and principals.

2. Contact must be reciprocal. If district programs and processes are to filter down to the classroom and have continuous impact on teaching and learning, all stakeholders in the organization must be committed and each must be free to apply the expertise required of his/her position to monitor these programs and processes. Reciprocal communication is needed between principal and supervisor that places high value on the ability of the principal to provide key information concerning the effectiveness of

district programs within his/her building and to suggest adjustments that may increase the effectiveness of these programs.

3. Contact must be on task. The primary responsibility of both principals and supervisors is to assist the district in carrying out its mission. If supervisor/principal contact is to make a significant contribution to the realization of the mission, it must also address programs that are in place and be alert to emerging needs within the classroom and school which may not as yet have received district-level attention.

Needless to say, the impact of frequent, reciprocal, on-task contact between principal and supervisor will be of limited value if both are not highly committed to current innovations and ongoing programs. This commitment, as mentioned previously, cannot be delivered to the principal by the supervisor. It evolves to the extent that the principal participates in the planning of the programs and innovations at the district level. This participation significantly increases the principal's understanding and commitment to these programs and innovations, and will greatly impact the success of their implementation within the classroom.

## Evaluation of Principals

During the early '80s, goal-based evaluation models were developed to meet the growing demand for accountability. These were followed by clinical evaluation models which provided assistance and opportunity for growth. Although these models vary to some degree, they have many

characteristics in common which are included to increase the effectiveness of principal evaluation by providing for growth and accountability (Bolton, 1980; Manatt, 1988; Redfern, 1983; Smith & Andrews, 1987; Valentine, 1987). The involvement of stakeholders in the planning of the evaluation system is included in most models to provide the sense of ownership and commitment needed to ensure the system's success. Clear expectations, including valid, reliable, and discriminating criteria are developed to ensure that principals understand what is expected and how it will be measured. Professional growth is stressed through the addition of formative evaluation, including clear and focused growth plans reflecting high expectations and tolerance for risk. Professional goals that support building and district goals are included to strengthen programs at these levels. Site visits, both scheduled and unscheduled, allow for observation, modeling, and authentic assessment of performance. Conferences built on trust include feedback that is helpful to principals seeking to improve or refine performance. Multiple sources of data, including portfolios and input from teachers, students, and parents offer a more accurate assessment of performance and increase objectivity and credibility. Principal evaluation is part of a district-wide system that evaluates the performance of all players. The evaluation system is supported by a comprehensive professional development program for staff and administrators.

These evaluation models designed to support the professional growth of principals provide for increased contact between principals and evaluators and therefore have the potential to support the demands of

restructured districts. This contact is directed toward the accomplishment of goals supportive of district priorities. When executed as designed, this contact includes two-way interaction between principal and supervisor. A closer look at individual principal evaluation models will help determine the degree to which these models meet the needs of productive districts by providing, in addition to accountability and growth, a system that includes frequent, reciprocal, on-task contact between principals and supervisors.

Development of principal evaluation during the '80s followed general evaluation trends of that period which included identification and completion of goals and teacher evaluation trends which stressed clinical evaluation. The following models described below and compared in Table 1 are representative of those adopted or adapted during the mid and late '80s for use by districts wanting to increase accountability, foster growth, and/or to comply with state mandates. To varying degrees, components of these models support requirements of productive organizations to provide frequent, on-task, reciprocal contact and strengthen commitments to organizational culture.

## Goal-based Models

According to Bolton (1980), evaluation systems that do not support the mission of the district will have difficulty surviving. Performance-based evaluation, built on the satisfactory accomplishment of goals, provides a means whereby principals may be held accountable for performance that supports the mission of the building or district. Bolton

Table 1. Comparison of research-based principal evaluation models

| | Bolton | Redfern | Smith/Andrews | Valentine | Manatt |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Develop | | Identify needs<br>Set objectives<br>Implement work plan<br>Assess results<br>Discuss results | | 12-15 members<br>Consultants | Steering committee<br>Subcommittees |
| Cycle | Planning<br>Collecting information<br>Using information | | | Developmental<br>Preparatory<br>Formative<br>Summative<br>Contractual | Establish plan<br>Formative<br>Summative<br>Goal setting |
| Purpose | Determined by participants | | Model evaluation methods for principal<br>Growth as instructional leader | Enhance leadership through on-going principal evaluation and organizational change | Improved administrator performance |
| Criteria | Determined by participants<br>Prioritized | Job description<br>NASSP administration skills | Use criteria that are in place | Established by committee<br>State developed 25 criteria<br>In four performance areas<br>Defined by 3-7 descriptors | Developed by stakeholders<br>Based on critical work activities<br>General and job specific |

Table 1. Continued

| | Bolton | Redfern | Smith/Andrews | Valentine | Manatt |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Goals | | Performance goals established by principal | 3-5 related to criteria<br>School environment<br>District and school goals<br>Staff needs<br>Student achievement<br>Performance goals | 4-6 per year<br>2-3 match school goals<br>2-3 match district goals | 3-5 |
| Plan | | Principal and evaluator identify needs | | School goals<br>Following scheduled observation<br>During post-observation conference (criteria) | Self-evaluation using criteria<br>Goal setting |

Table 1. Continued

| | Bolton | Redfern | Smith/Andrews | Valentine | Manatt |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Clinical | Data by participant:<br>Observation<br>Questions<br>Written documentation (several sources) | Progress review in December and March | Regularly scheduled site visits (minimum monthly)<br>Provide for feedback<br>Two observations of teacher evaluation sequence<br>Mid-year conference | Scheduled observation<br>Minimum one-half to one day shadowing<br>Post-observation conference (Feedback form) | Pre-observation conference<br>Slice of time (shadow)<br>Post-observation conference<br>Supervisory observation<br>Post-observation conference |
| Data | | Scale or narrative | Artifacts<br>Observations<br>Teachers evaluate<br>May use school profile | Formal and informal observation<br>Nonobserved:<br>Shadowing<br>Staff input<br>Parent survey<br>Time log<br>Input to superintendent<br>Minutes | Climate<br>Student achievement<br>Information observation<br>Input from other administrators, faculty, students, parents |

Table 1. Continued

| | Bolton | Redfern | Smith/Andrews | Valentine | Manatt |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Growth | | Developmental plan | Principal prepares individual assessment | Based on desire to improve on criteria<br>All have one or more<br>Evaluator:<br>Provides resources<br>Checks for understanding<br>Provides for practice<br>Provides feedback | Pick:<br>Capital performance<br>Capital improvement<br>Commitment (written for half year) |
| Decision | | Principal and evaluator complete assessment<br>Scale or narrative or both<br>Appraisal conference<br>Plan next cycle | Self-assessment based on data<br>Use criteria for summary report<br>New goals for next year | | Written by evaluator<br>Discuss<br>Set performance improvement commitment for next year |

stresses that evaluation, if it is to be effective, must be based on information which is useful and applied to meaningful purposes. Based on these tenets and drawing from the concept of management by objectives (MBO), Bolton developed a goal-based administrator evaluation cycle. The three phases of this cycle and the options defined within each phase provide a framework for districts and educators interested in developing a goal-based evaluation model for school administrators.

The cycle consists of the following stages, which are repeated annually:

1. Planning: The situation is analyzed, the purpose of evaluation is decided, broad goals and specific objectives are established, and means of measuring are determined.

2. Collecting information: Action is taken, and the process and product are measured.

3. Using information: An evaluation conference is planned, information is analyzed and interpreted, and decisions are made.

Bolton's model is meant to serve as a guideline for the development of an administrative evaluation system. As such, it does not offer specific criteria or methods. Rather, Bolton provides information useful to districts as they make decisions concerning their own evaluation models. He stresses the importance of identifying and clearly communicating the purpose of the evaluation if it is to be effective. Possible purposes that may be identified by organizations are among the following: 1) changing goals or objectives, 2) modifying procedures,

3) determining new ways of implementing procedures, 4) improving performance of individuals, 5) supplying information for modification of assignments, 6) protecting individuals or school systems, 7) rewarding superior performance, 8) providing a basis for career planning, and individual growth and development, 9) validating selection process, and 10) facilitating self-evaluation. Bolton also suggests possible criteria that are frequently overlooked when evaluating principals, including: 1) cognitive complexity, 2) awareness, 3) decisiveness, 4) personality, 5) boundary spanning, and 6) entrepreneurial ability.

This model holds administrators accountable for supporting district programs through the setting and achieving of goals. Growth is one of the several purposes from which a district may choose, and as such may or may not be important in a given district using this model. Because this model is flexible, the frequency of contact between supervisor and principal is established by the district. The emphasis on goals helps keep this contact on task.

Redfern's (1983) principal evaluation model is an example of a system originally designed for the evaluation of teachers, and later revised and adjusted to meet a growing demand that principals be evaluated. This model consists of a cycle that includes the following steps:

1. Identify needs: Together the principal and supervisor identify technical competencies through job descriptions; administrative skills, as defined by the NASSP Assessment Center Project; and performance goals based on current building and district goals, past evaluation reports, and current performance in relation to these expectations.

2. Set objectives and work plans: The principal and evaluator prepare separate assessments of the status of current performance which serve as the basis for a) a Developmental Plan written by the principal to fine-tune competencies or to undertake professional growth, or b) an Improvement Plan written by principal and evaluator which addresses specific deficiencies.

3. Implement work plans: When the work plan is finalized and approved, the principal meets with the evaluator at mid year and the end of the year to review progress toward completion of the work plan.

4. Assess results: A self-assessment is completed by the principal and an assessment is completed by the evaluator.

5. Discuss results: Both assessments are reviewed, the End-of-Year Evaluation Report Forms are signed, and plans are made for next year's evaluation. The cycle is then repeated.

The steps of this model are completed through joint cooperation of the supervisor and the subordinate. To increase the effectiveness of the system in dealing with principals who demonstrate poor performance, Redfern recommends that deficiencies be identified and targeted in an improvement plan and the frequency of assistance be increased (Redfern, 1983).

Redfern's model allows for some contact between principal and supervisor. The focus of this contact is on the completion of a growth plan. District goals are consulted during the planning stages, but the main focus of the growth plan is to address administrative skills. The contact described in Redfern's model allows for equal input from both

parties, but this is narrowed to the discussion of the principal's performance.

Redfern's model addresses the demand for accountability through the use of criteria that address the ability of the principal to meet performance standards and the demand for growth through the use of developmental and improvement plans. Responsibility for successfully completing each goal is left to the principal, which decreases the frequency of contact between principal and supervisor. Although district goals are referred to in planning, contact does not focus on these or on existing programs or innovations. The recommended process emphasizes a two-way contact but does not take advantage of the expertise of the principal.

## Clinical Evaluation Models

Goal-based models increased accountability. However, it was through the acceptance of clinical models that districts acknowledged responsibility for the growth of principals as instructional leaders. In the early '80s, clinical supervision gained wide acceptance as an effective method of improving instruction and fostering professional development of teachers. It became apparent that this method held promise for the evaluation of principals. In addition to goal setting featured in previous models, contact between supervisors and principals is greatly increased as the supervisors take a direct role in helping principals to achieve their goals. This is accomplished through the development of a growth plan, site visits, observation of action, coaching and conferences,

relevant dialog, and feedback. Smith and Andrews (1989) present a model that places heavy emphasis on developing the principal's skill in evaluating teachers and includes heavy involvement of the supervisor in the teacher evaluation cycle. Based on Bolton's cyclical evaluation design, this model consists of three phases that are repeated each year and is designed to strengthen and improve the principal as an instructional leader. The cycles include:

Phase I - Designing the evaluation plan: The supervisor and principal collaborate to consider the school environment, district goals and priorities, school goals, staff needs and interests, student achievement and needs, and suggested goals from the previous year's evaluation. The demand that each of these places on the performance of the principal as instructional leader is determined. Three to five goals are then set which include measurable outcomes, appropriate strategies, time lines, scheduling of school visits, determine method of data collection, and relation of goals to performance criteria.

Phase II - Collecting data and observing performance: Regular school visits (recommended monthly), provision for feedback through conferences, and completion of two teacher evaluation observation sequences are included in this phase. Each teacher evaluation sequence includes a pre-observation conference, a classroom observation, a lesson analysis and conference plan, a post-observation conference between principal and teacher, a conference analysis and plan, and a principal/evaluator debriefing conference. During the phases of this sequence, the supervisor may serve as an observer or an active participant. The debriefing

conference usually results in the identification of a professional growth objective for the principal.

Phase III - Analyzing the data and evaluating the strengths: This phase includes the writing of the summative evaluation and a conference with the principal where new goals for the coming year are identified.

This model places heavy emphasis on the observation of and involvement in the principal's clinical evaluation of teachers. It requires a substantial time commitment on the part of both principal and supervisor, and a recommended supervision span that does not exceed 16 people. A collaborative relationship and commitment to continuous learning and growth of both principal and supervisor determine the success of this model (Smith & Andrews, 1989). The principal is held accountable for student achievement through intense clinical supervision of teachers. Growth as an instructional leader and coaching are emphasized. The frequent contact between principal and supervisor recommended by this model provides ample opportunity for the supervisor to model instructional leadership and clinical evaluation skills.

Reform legislation in several states mandated the use of a state developed principal evaluation model. An example is the Performance/ Outcome Principal Evaluation developed for use in the state of Missouri (Valentine, 1987). All schools in the state are required to use this system and the accompanying evaluation instrument or an alternate plan and instrument approved by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. This model is based on a philosophy that embraces trust and collegiality further defined by the following issues: 1) personnel

development versus personnel dismissal, 2) high evaluator/high principal involvement versus high evaluator/low principal involvement, 3) personalized assessment and differentiated responsibilities versus comparative assessment and commonality responsibilities, 4) instructional leadership versus managerial leadership, and 5) performance/outcome assessment versus performance assessment.

The following four stages comprise this model:

1. Developmental Stage: Through collaborative planning, a committee that is representative of all stakeholders develops the evaluation plan. If the plan is to be successful, leaders must be committed to collaboration and a philosophy of improvement.

2. Participant Stage: Principals and evaluators are inserviced. In order to maintain a high level of effectiveness, this inservice should be repeated on a regular basis.

3. Formative Stage: Clinical supervision is accomplished through scheduled and unscheduled visits, review of nonobserved and artifact data, and development and completion of growth plans. During this stage, goals are set, reviewed, and modified.

4. Summative Stage: Criteria performance, growth plans, and goal accomplishment are reviewed, and goal identification for the next year is completed.

Each of the performance criteria included in this model is defined by three to seven descriptors and provides the basis for data collection, conferences, growth plans, and summative reports. The model has a dual focus consisting of a professional development strand based on performance

criteria and an organizational improvement strand addressed by four to six school goals a year, two or three of which coordinate with district goals.

Reciprocal contact between principal and evaluator is stressed in this model. If the model is followed as designed, the contact is frequent and is kept on task through attention to criteria and building and district goals.

A strength of the Administrator Performance Evaluation model developed by the School Improvement Model (SIM) of Iowa State University and featured as a video-based learning album distributed by AASA is its application as part of a total systems/outcomes-based approach to raising K-12 achievement (Manatt & Stow, 1982; Manatt, 1989). Manatt places evaluation into two categories, behaviorally based and effect-based, and presents a model which integrates the two. This model is cyclical, consisting of 15 steps which fall into the categories of formative and summative evaluation. The use of performance improvement commitments (PICs) and organizational goals ensures that progress is made toward expected outcomes. The categories are subdivided as follows:

Formative Evaluation: This includes establishing the evaluation plan, setting a benchmark of administrator performance, critical self-evaluation, a goal setting conference, a pre-observation conference, a slice-of-time observation, analysis of data/conference preparation, immediate feedback/post-observation conference, supervisory observation, post-supervisory observation conference, and the addition of other data.

Summative Evaluation: Included are preparation of the summative written report, the summative conference, preparation of a written agreement, and the listing of results.

Participatory planning is accomplished through use of a stakeholders' committee and supporting subcommittees that address the issues of philosophic premises, performance areas and criteria, operational procedures, forms and records, and field test procedures. Components of the planning process include the following:

1. Administrative Philosophy: A general statement is used to determine the consistency of an administrator's performance with the district's philosophy.

2. Performance Factors: Based on job descriptions, which include improving the educational process, implementing district policies, working with the community, staff personnel, and managing operations.

3. Critical Work Activities: Continuous regular activities needed for daily operation of organization are recorded through time logging and submitted to system analysis. The results are used to determine the congruence of the administrator's performance on critical work activities with the priorities and needs of subordinates.

4. Job Improvement Targets: Occur after the end-of-cycle conference, usually three to five developed by the principal with input from the evaluator.

5. Field Test: In order to establish baseline data concerning the administrator's performance, teacher input is solicited and in some cases input from students and parents.

New and sophisticated instruments and methods are available that broaden the scope of data gathering available for use in evaluation (Manatt, 1988). System analysis, time logging, and administrative philosophy are factors which help researchers and administrators to create instruments and procedures to form a solid base of methodology for performance evaluation of principals. In addition, advanced techniques allow for the appraisal of school climate, student achievement, and student and teacher feedback as data to be used in performance appraisal.

This model focuses on student achievement through improvement of principal performance. Frequent contact between principal and supervisor focuses on this performance and its ability to support district goals.

## Superintendents' Role and Principal Evaluation

Recent models address the role of the principal and the evaluator of principals. In small districts principals are evaluated by the superintendent of schools; in large districts the superintendent, as chief executive officer, is not directly involved in the evaluation of principals. In large and small districts, recent research has found that in effective districts the superintendent assumes the role of instructional leader, just as earlier research found that the principal serves as the instructional leader of effective schools.

If the performance evaluation of principals is to be effective, superintendents must model instructional leadership. "The superintendent is the prime person in each school district, developing a sense of mission, establishing a positive climate, and overseeing implementation of

the mission" (Crowson, 1987, p. 60). Superintendents must provide vigorous educational leadership in light of the current need to improve the quality of education in American schools (Wallace, 1986). Among the ten key components of leadership identified by Wallace is the following, which addresses the supervision of principals.

> Recognition of the key role that principals play in school improvement is vital. The old adage that good principals make good schools is quite correct. However, being a good principal, from the author's perspective, requires that one be a strong instructional leader. Therefore, the superintendent as educational leader must take seriously the responsibility to develop the educational or instructional leadership capability in principals. While instructional leadership itself may be somewhat of an elusive quality, the knowledge base with respect to instructional leadership is not. The knowledge of curriculum, models of instruction and instructional evaluation can be taught, learned and operationalized. (Wallace, 1986, p. 21)

Investigating the involvement of superintendents in principal evaluation, Murphy, Hallinger, and Peterson (1985) chose 12 of the most effective districts in California (as evidenced by test scores, which, over a three-year period, consistently exceeded their expected range of student achievement in the areas of reading, math, and language arts, taking into consideration socioeconomic levels). A high level of superintendent involvement was found in the following areas: 1) setting goals and establishing expectations and standards, 2) selecting staff, 3) supervising and evaluating staff, 4) establishing an instructional and curricular focus, 5) ensuring consistency in technical core operations, and 6) monitoring curriculum and instruction. Ten of the 12 superintendents surveyed held primary responsibility for supervising principals, including campus visits, and an average of 8% of their work

year was spent in schools. Four of them reviewed their principals' clinical supervision activities; some checked the progress of principals' objectives. School visits were used to build climate, provide information in evaluating performance, and to validate information collected from the resources. The relationship between district goals and evaluation of principals was strong, as opposed to the perfunctory relationship found in many districts.

## Status of Principal Evaluation

In a comprehensive review of research concerning principal evaluation including surveys and research studies, etc., Ginsberg (1989) found that surveys concerning quantity and quality of principal evaluation reveal the following trends: 1) more evaluation is taking place; 2) evaluation is done on an annual basis; 3) behaviors are matched with performance standards; 4) most evaluation is subjective in nature; 5) principals hold the least favorable view of evaluation systems in use; and 6) problems exist in rating performance. Although little research exists concerning the rating of principal performance, studies available indicate similar findings to those revealed by surveys and, in addition, indicate the principal's performance is rarely observed, several types of indicators are necessary, and the superintendent is involved in the process in effective districts.

A strong case for the further study of principal evaluation is presented by Ginsberg, based on several factors: 1) the principal has been identified as the key element in school effectiveness, 2) the nature

of the work may require a specialized form of evaluation, 3) functions characteristic of successful principals in effective schools are conceptual and not easy to operationalize, and 4) diversity of educations may require evaluation specific to principalship.

## Summary

Clearly, the challenge of improving our schools is closely linked to the effective development and evaluation of principals. "Today the individual school is increasingly recognized as the promising unit for analysis and the critical force for change and improvement of pupil performance" (Barth, 1990). Effective schools are given direction by effective administrators. Evaluation plays a key role in establishing and maintaining this direction (Hord, 1990). Organizational research indicates a new role as a key contributor to the development and maintenance of district culture, readiness for change, and the successful implementation of school and district improvement.

During the '80s, organizational literature revealed characteristics that contribute to the effectiveness of successful organizations. In addition, literature concerned with organizational change identified factors that support readiness for adjustment and change within organizations and processes that help ensure successful implementation of individual innovations. The application of this literature to schools suggests that a strong network of two-way communication and continuous top-down bottom-up planning and monitoring are needed to support a productive district culture and successful school and district

improvement. This requires frequent contact between principal and supervisor reciprocal in nature and on task, addressing the ability of programs in place and innovations to support the mission of the district. The models developed to evaluate the performance of principals are supportive of these concepts. Based on a process of interaction between principal and supervisor, these models allow each to function as a key link in restructured districts. In addition to their original purpose, that of assuring accountability and growth, these evaluation models have the potential to make a significant contribution to the success of districts that elect to readjust or restructure their organization.

Although the processes recommended in these models are highly supportive of successful restructuring and improvement within schools (Bolton, 1980), the relationship between the principal and supervisor may be less supportive, or may, in fact, inhibit the successful development of a strong district culture and the effective implementation of district and school improvement. The degree which the principal, the supervisor, and other key players in the district value productive two-way communication and vertical collaborative planning and monitoring will determine the degree which principal evaluation is effective in contributing to school improvement.

# CHAPTER III. METHODS

Current models of principal evaluation have been developed to improve performance, facilitate professional growth, and provide accountability. The purpose of this investigation was to determine the extent components of current research-based models of principal evaluation were being used throughout the United States and the perceived effectiveness of these models. The need to determine the status of principal evaluation in the United States provided the rationale for this study.

## Research Design

A correlational design determined the magnitude of the relationship between perceived effectiveness and the type of principal evaluation in use, between perceived effectiveness and conditions of principal evaluation, and between demographic characteristics and effectiveness, type, and conditions of the systems used. The population included all districts with 20 or more teachers in all 50 states in the United States that had no mandatory teacher evaluation in 1988. The sample was randomly selected from the population following stratification by size and geographic area, using nonproportional sampling rates for each of the resulting cells. All districts with more than 2,000 teachers were included.

## Procedures

### Development of the questionnaire

A review of literature dealing with the performance evaluation of principals served as the basis for the survey instrument. Theories of organizational structure and change also contributed to its content. Gathering of demographic data was included to identify characteristics of schools and districts, including the size of the district and the socioeconomic level of the district. Socioeconomic level was determined in two ways, by cost per pupil (determined by dividing the district operating budget for the current year by the number of students in the district) and percent of students on free and reduced lunch in the school and its district. The respondents were asked to identify the organizational structure of the district as centralized, site-based, or a combination of both, and the community as rural, urban, suburban, or a combination. Demographic data were also gathered concerning evaluators and principals including position, age, gender, and the experience of the respondents.

Type of evaluation was established by determining the frequency of use of key components and supporting practices of principal evaluation as described in several principal evaluation models (Bolton, 1980; Manatt & Stow, 1982; Redfern, 1983; Smith & Andrews, 1988; Valentine, 1987). These include site visits, conferences, feedback, goals, and multiple data sources, and each was measured in two ways. Respondents were asked to check one of several indicators describing frequency of occurrence or content on a continuing scale. Respondents were requested to complete a

second set of questions addressing these same components by identifying all descriptors that further define them. Included in this section were two additional components describing type of evaluation: direct evaluation of instructional leadership and professional development.

Conditions of evaluation were determined through the use of research-based variables that impact the effectiveness of evaluation. These included degree of decentralization, training of both principal and evaluator, length of time the system has been in place, the span of control and percent of supervisors' time spent on principal evaluation, and the use of incentives. Respondents were asked to choose one of several descriptors on a continuous scale.

Perceptions of effectiveness were determined through the use of six factors including the ability of the principal evaluation system to identify problems, improve performance, foster growth, increase communication, monitor accountability, and impact student achievement. Each was scored on a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

## Instrumentation

The questionnaire was divided into eight sections. The first section established the age, gender, and experience of the respondent. The second section determined the size, level, free lunch count, and enrollment of the building or district, the type of community (urban, suburban, rural), and the organization of the district (central, site-based, both). The existence of a formal evaluation system was established in section three,

and overall effectiveness was determined by offering the respondent a choice of effective or ineffective in response to the question, "How effective is the district's principal evaluation system?" The type of principal evaluation was determined in section four, which asked the respondent to choose components that were part of their system and the frequency of their use. Taken from current research on principal evaluation, these components included purpose, site visits, conferences, feedback, goal setting, evaluation of instructional leadership, and professional development. Respondents were also asked to choose among several descriptors that further defined each component. The fifth section investigated conditions of principal evaluation, including amount of training received by principals and evaluators, years of experience of the respondent with this system, number of years the system has been in place, input of stakeholders into development of the system, and existence and type of compensation attached to the system. Section six dealt with facets of perceived effectiveness of the system in use, including its ability to measure actual behavior, to identify problems, and to improve principal performance. Section seven investigated attitudes and perceived attitudes of those within the district concerning evaluation and growth. The eighth section investigated sense of efficacy concerning several facets of principalship.

A judgment panel consisting of principals, superintendents, professors of educational administration, and central office administrators with evaluation responsibilities was asked to review and respond to the instrument. The instrument was revised and an initial

mailing was sent to all districts in the sample, followed 3 weeks later by a second mailing to all nonresponding districts.

## Sample design

The data source from which the sample was drawn was based on two documents. The Common Core of Data Public School Universe computer tape (1988) and the Directory of Public Elementary and Secondary Education Agencies (1988) from the United States Department of Education, published by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, which contained 15,579 local public school districts in the United States and defined the population from which the sample was drawn. This study was conducted in connection with a longitudinal research project concerned with evaluation practices in states where none had been mandated; therefore, states that had mandated teacher evaluation at the time the sample was drawn were omitted. The following states were not included in the population from which the sample was drawn: Alabama, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, North and South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. All districts in the remaining states that had more than 20 teachers were stratified by number of teachers and by geographic location. All districts with more than 2,000 teachers were included in the sample.

## Weighting the sample

A stratified sample with differing sampling rates was required by the design of the study, which included all districts with 2,000 or more teachers. The sample was stratified by size as determined by the number

of teachers in the district and by the geographic area. Five strata of size and eight strata of region yielded 40 cells. The districts to be included in the sample were randomly selected from each cell using nonproportional sampling rates. (In order to maintain adequate representation of larger districts and districts in sparsely populated regions, different sampling rates were applied to individual cells.) This necessitated the assignment of an individual expansion weight to each of the 40 cells, and the application of these weights to each district within the cell. The expansion weight for each jth cell was computed as the reciprocal of the response/population [(Rj/Pj)-1] where Rj=number of districts responding in the jth cell and Pj=the total number of districts in the jth cell (Hickman, 1990; Petrone, 1990). Because the return rate was different for evaluators, high school principals, and elementary principals, expansion weights were calculated for each of these three data sets. (See Tables 2, 3, and 4.)

Table 2. Sample expansion weights for supervisors of principals listed by size and United States geographic area

| Geographic area | Number of teachers in the district | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 20-119 | 120-249 | 250-599 | 600-1,999 | ≥2,000 |
| | Expansion weights | | | | |
| New England | 61 | 21 | 16 | 6 | 0 |
| Mideast | 71 | 24 | 27 | 6 | 2 |
| Southeast | 33 | 17 | 13 | 5 | 2 |
| Great Lakes | 77 | 32 | 11 | 6 | 2 |
| Great Plains | 47 | 33 | 12 | 4 | 2 |
| Southwest | 91 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 2 |
| Rocky Mountains | 73 | 13 | 9 | 11 | 1 |
| Far West | 57 | 21 | 17 | 8 | 3 |

Table 3. Sample expansion weights for high school principals listed by size and United States geographic area

| Geographic area | Number of teachers in the district | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 20-119 | 120-249 | 250-599 | 600-1,999 | ≥2,000 |
| | Expansion weights | | | | |
| New England | 71 | 26 | 16 | 6 | 0 |
| Mideast | 66 | 27 | 20 | 5 | 2 |
| Southeast | 39 | 24 | 17 | 4 | 2 |
| Great Lakes | 63 | 32 | 11 | 7 | 3 |
| Great Plains | 47 | 33 | 12 | 5 | 2 |
| Southwest | 91 | 23 | 6 | 6 | 1 |
| Rocky Mountains | 97 | 17 | 9 | 7 | 1 |
| Far West | 53 | 31 | 17 | 15 | 3 |

Table 4. Sample expansion weights for elementary principals listed by size and United States geographic area

| Geographic area | Number of teachers in the district | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 20-119 | 120-249 | 250-599 | 600-1,999 | ≥2,000 |
| | Expansion weights | | | | |
| New England | 61 | 21 | 13 | 6 | 0 |
| Mideast | 61 | 22 | 20 | 5 | 2 |
| Southeast | 32 | 17 | 13 | 4 | 2 |
| Great Lakes | 54 | 27 | 10 | 6 | 2 |
| Great Plains | 38 | 33 | 12 | 4 | 2 |
| Southwest | 76 | 23 | 6 | 5 | 1 |
| Rocky Mountains | 73 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 1 |
| Far West | 46 | 19 | 15 | 8 | 3 |

Collection of the data

Survey packets were sent to the superintendent of each district within the sample. A list of schools generated by the computer and addresses from ASCUS provided the mailing information. The title "Superintendent" prefaced the address. No names were included in the address. Each envelope included a letter of transmittal and three questionnaires with a stamped addressed envelope attached to each. The transmittal letter was printed on School Improvement Model stationery (Appendix A). The purpose of the study was explained in the letter, and superintendents were asked to route the questionnaires to the following respondents--an evaluator of principals, the high school principal first on the alphabetical list, and the elementary principal first on the alphabetical list. Three hundred and seventeen districts replied to the first mailing.

A second mailing, identical to the first with the addition of a yellow insert requesting that the survey be completed, was distributed 3 weeks later to all nonresponding districts. An additional 111 districts responded to the second mailing, a total of 428 districts, or 63% of the original 682 schools included in the sample. Using the questionnaire, telephone interviews were conducted with a random sample drawn from districts that did not respond to check for the existence of possible bias in the data.

Treatment of the data

A code number was assigned to each district in the sample, determined by the district's position in alphabetical order by state and by district within the state. The number was placed on each of the three questionnaires sent to that district. This coding was necessary to determine which schools should receive a second mailing and which schools should receive a copy of the results of the study.

Data analysis Data to be analyzed was taken from 428 questionnaires resulting from initial and follow-up mailings. Data were distributed into three sets as follows: 1) evaluators that could be paired with a high school and/or elementary principal, 2) responding high school principals and their evaluators, 3) responding elementary principals and their evaluators.

Inferential statistical procedures Data analysis was performed using the SPSS statistical package (Norusis, 1983) on the Iowa State University mainframe and the PC CARP (1986) IBM statistical package with an IBM personal computer. Sample weights were applied and descriptive tables were generated using SPSS; inferential statistics needed to test the hypothesis were completed using PC CARP.

The PC CARP statistical package offers an accurate estimate of variance when disproportionate sampling rates among strata are employed. This package was used to compute correlational and multivariate correlational statistics. Analysis of variance was used to determine which components of the construct "type of evaluation" contributed heavily to perceived effectiveness of evaluation systems and which conditions of

evaluation contributed heavily to perceived effectiveness of evaluation systems. Correlational analysis was used to determine which demographic variables contributed to type, conditions, and effectiveness of evaluation.

The level of significance was established at .05, and appropriate degrees of freedom were determined for each test. Any test yielding a probability of >.05 resulted in rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternate hypothesis.

Variables The following variables were employed in inferential statistical procedures.

1. Type of evaluation. A score was calculated for each component of the construct "type of evaluation" by combining a score that represented frequency of use and a score that represented research-based practices used to support the component. Scores indicating frequency were on a continuous scale of 1 to 4. Scores indicating supporting practices were dichotomous; each existing practice was given a score of 1. The resulting scores were placed into three data sets representing "type of evaluation" as reported by evaluators, as reported by high school principals, and as reported by elementary principals.

2. Conditions of evaluation. Each of the individual conditions that comprised this variable was represented by a continuous score derived from categories that form a scale of value as identified by research on principal evaluation. The exception was the score for "percent of time," which was a continuous score representing the actual percentage of the supervisor's time spent on the evaluation of principals.

3. Perceived effectiveness. The scores of six individual facets of perceived effectiveness were summed to calculate the variable perceived effectiveness.

4. Size. District size was determined by the number of classroom teachers employed in the district when the sample was drawn in 1988.

5. Socioeconomic status. Two measures were used to identify the socioeconomic status of districts within the sample. The first, cost per pupil, was determined by dividing the operational budget of the district by the number of students in the district for the 1991-92 school year. The second measure was the percent of students within the district that applied for free and reduced lunch during the same year. The percent of students applying for free and reduced lunch was also used as an indication of the socioeconomic level of individual schools.

Descriptive statistical procedures The SPSS computer package and mainframe of Iowa State University were used to compute frequencies, weighted counts, and weighted percentages.

## Treatment of Subjects

A description of the project was submitted to the Iowa State University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research, and it was determined that the rights and welfare of the human subjects were adequately protected, risks were outweighed by the potential benefits and expected value of the knowledge sought, confidentiality of data was assured, and informed consent was obtained by appropriate procedures.

# CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS

## Introduction

The purpose of the study was twofold--to investigate the status of principal evaluation in the United States and to explore relationships among type of evaluation, conditions, perceived effectiveness, and demographics. A questionnaire, based on current models of principal evaluation and characteristics of effective organizational structure and change, was used to gather data.

The sample, consisting of 682 school districts, was drawn in 1988 for use in an ongoing study of personnel evaluation practices of public schools in the United States conducted by the School Improvement Model (SIM) of Iowa State University. At the time the sample was drawn, nine states had mandated systems of teacher evaluation. These states were not included in the population from which the sample was drawn. The 682 districts that comprise the sample represent all 9,431 public school districts of the 41 remaining states. Initial contact was made with the superintendent of these districts and 317 districts responded. A second mailing was distributed which resulted in responses from 111 additional district. A total of 1,074 questionnaires, returned by evaluators of principals, high school principals, and elementary principals from 428 districts, represented a return of 62.8% of the districts in the sample.

## Questionnaire Return Rate

To ensure the sample was representative of school districts throughout the United States, the population was stratified by region and by size. Five strata of size and eight of region were applied to the population, resulting in 40 cells. Sampling rates were established for each cell, and individual districts were randomly selected within each cell to identify the sample. Within each cell, responses were received from three groups, viz., evaluators of principals, high school principals, and elementary principals. These responses provided information which was distributed into three data sets as follows: 1) responding elementary principals who could be paired with a principal evaluator from the same district; 2) responding high school principals who could be paired with a principal evaluator from the same district; and 3) all responding evaluators of principals who could be matched with either a high school principal, an elementary principal, or both.

The return rates are found in Table 5 and are disaggregated by size, region, cell (size x region), and by response group (evaluators, high school principals, and elementary principals). The return rate of all but 16 of the 40 cells exceeded 60%; the rate of 12 cells equaled or exceeded 75%.

Although 63% of the districts in the sample returned questionnaires, not all included a response from each of the three groups, i.e., an evaluator of principals, a high school principal, and an elementary principal. Therefore, the response rate, as presented in Table 5, is different for each of these groups. The highest overall response was from

Table 5. Frequencies and percentages of districts, evaluators, and elementary and high school principals by region and size of district

| Total schools and returns by region | 20-119 | | 120-249 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |
| **New England** | | | | |
| Total districts | 428 | | 185 | |
| Districts in sample | 16 | | 14 | |
| Districts returning questionnaires | 7 | 44 | 9 | 64 |
| Returned by evaluator | 7 | 44 | 9 | 64 |
| Returned by high school principal | 7 | 44 | 7 | 50 |
| Returned by elementary principal | 7 | 44 | 9 | 64 |
| **Mideast** | | | | |
| Total districts | 921 | | 482 | |
| Districts in sample | 29 | | 43 | |
| Districts returning questionnaires | 20 | 69 | 27 | 60 |
| Returned by evaluator | 20 | 69 | 25 | 58 |
| Returned by high school principal | 15 | 52 | 20 | 47 |
| Returned by elementary principal | 15 | 52 | 22 | 51 |
| **Southeast** | | | | |
| Total districts | 196 | | 167 | |
| Districts in sample | 13 | | 19 | |
| Districts returning questionnaires | 9 | 69 | 11 | 58 |
| Returned by evaluator | 9 | 69 | 11 | 58 |
| Returned by high school principal | 6 | 46 | 7 | 37 |
| Returned by elementary principal | 7 | 54 | 10 | 53 |
| **Great Lakes** | | | | |
| Total districts | 1,777 | | 519 | |
| Districts in sample | 57 | | 46 | |
| Districts returning questionnaires | 34 | 60 | 22 | 48 |
| Returned by evaluator | 32 | 56 | 22 | 48 |
| Returned by high school principal | 27 | 47 | 19 | 41 |
| Returned by elementary principal | 22 | 39 | 18 | 39 |
| **Great Plains** | | | | |
| Total districts | 1,397 | | 166 | |
| Districts in sample | 53 | | 14 | |
| Districts returning questionnaires | 38 | 72 | 10 | 71 |
| Returned by evaluator | 38 | 72 | 7 | 50 |
| Returned by high school principal | 31 | 55 | 10 | 71 |
| Returned by elementary principal | 30 | 53 | 8 | 57 |

| Number of teachers in the district | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 250-599 | | 600-1,999 | | >2,000 | | Total | |
| No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |
| 79 | | 17 | | 1 | | 710 | |
| 12 | | 6 | | 1 | | 49 | |
| 6 | 50 | 3 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 51.0 |
| 6 | 50 | 3 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 51.0 |
| 5 | 42 | 3 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 49.0 |
| 5 | 42 | 3 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 44.9 |
| 245 | | 49 | | 12 | | 1,709 | |
| 39 | | 14 | | 11 | | 136 | |
| 18 | 44 | 10 | 71 | 6 | 55 | 81 | 59.6 |
| 14 | 36 | 10 | 71 | 5 | 45 | 74 | 54.4 |
| 15 | 36 | 9 | 64 | 5 | 45 | 64 | 47.1 |
| 12 | 31 | 5 | 36 | 4 | 24 | 58 | 42.6 |
| 119 | | 51 | | 18 | | 551 | |
| 19 | | 17 | | 18 | | 86 | |
| 11 | 58 | 13 | 76 | 14 | 78 | 58 | 67.4 |
| 10 | 53 | 13 | 76 | 11 | 61 | 54 | 62.8 |
| 8 | 42 | 12 | 71 | 11 | 61 | 44 | 51.1 |
| 10 | 53 | 10 | 58 | 12 | 67 | 49 | 60.0 |
| 216 | | 57 | | 2 | | 2,571 | |
| 33 | | 15 | | 7 | | 158 | |
| 25 | 76 | 10 | 67 | 6 | 86 | 97 | 61.0 |
| 23 | 70 | 8 | 53 | 3 | 43 | 88 | 55.7 |
| 23 | 70 | 8 | 53 | 2 | 29 | 79 | 50.0 |
| 22 | 67 | 9 | 60 | 3 | 43 | 74 | 46.8 |
| 99 | | 25 | | 5 | | 1,692 | |
| 11 | | 7 | | 5 | | 90 | |
| 9 | 82 | 7 | 100 | 3 | 60 | 67 | 77.4 |
| 9 | 82 | 4 | 57 | 3 | 60 | 61 | 67.8 |
| 8 | 73 | 5 | 71 | 3 | 60 | 57 | 63.3 |
| 9 | 82 | 4 | 57 | 3 | 60 | 54 | 60.0 |

Table 5. Continued

| Total schools and returns by region | 20-119 No. | 20-119 Percent | 120-249 No. | 120-249 Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Southwest** | | | | |
| Total districts | 547 | | 69 | |
| Districts in sample | 13 | | 6 | |
| Districts returning questionnaires | 7 | 54 | 4 | 50 |
| Returned by evaluator | 7 | 54 | 3 | 50 |
| Returned by high school principal | 7 | 54 | 4 | 50 |
| Returned by elementary principal | 7 | 54 | 1 | 17 |
| **Rocky Mountains** | | | | |
| Total districts | 290 | | 52 | |
| Districts in sample | 10 | | 5 | |
| Districts returning questionnaires | 4 | 40 | 5 | 100 |
| Returned by evaluator | 4 | 40 | 5 | 100 |
| Returned by high school principal | 3 | 30 | 3 | 60 |
| Returned by elementary principal | 4 | 40 | 4 | 80 |
| **Far West** | | | | |
| Total districts | 653 | | 214 | |
| Districts in sample | 25 | | 18 | |
| Districts returning questionnaires | 12 | 48 | 12 | 67 |
| Returned by evaluator | 12 | 48 | 14 | 78 |
| Returned by high school principal | 9 | 36 | 9 | 50 |
| Returned by elementary principal | 11 | 44 | 12 | 67 |
| **Total** | | | | |
| Total districts | 6,209 | | 1,854 | |
| Districts in sample | 216 | | 165 | |
| Districts returning questionnaires | 131 | 60.6 | 100 | 60.6 |
| Returned by evaluator | 127 | 58.8 | 95 | 57.6 |
| Returned by high school principal | 103 | 47.7 | 79 | 47.9 |
| Returned by elementary principal | 102 | 47.2 | 84 | 50.9 |

| Number of teachers in the district | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 250-599 | | 600-1,999 | | >2,000 | | Total | |
| No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |
| 36 | | 19 | | 4 | | 675 | |
| 6 | | 8 | | 4 | | 37 | |
| 6 | 100 | 5 | 63 | 3 | 75 | 25 | 67.6 |
| 6 | 100 | 4 | 50 | 3 | 75 | 23 | 62.2 |
| 6 | 100 | 2 | 25 | 3 | 75 | 22 | 59.5 |
| 6 | 100 | 3 | 38 | 2 | 50 | 19 | 51.4 |
| 28 | | 22 | | 5 | | 397 | |
| 4 | | 6 | | 5 | | 30 | |
| 3 | 75 | 3 | 50 | 5 | 100 | 20 | 66.7 |
| 3 | 75 | 3 | 50 | 5 | 100 | 20 | 66.7 |
| 3 | 75 | 3 | 50 | 5 | 100 | 17 | 56.7 |
| 3 | 75 | 2 | 34 | 5 | 100 | 18 | 60.0 |
| 174 | | 75 | | 10 | | 1,126 | |
| 23 | | 20 | | 10 | | 96 | |
| 13 | 52 | 11 | 55 | 7 | 70 | 55 | 57.3 |
| 13 | 57 | 9 | 45 | 5 | 50 | 53 | 55.2 |
| 12 | 52 | 6 | 30 | 6 | 60 | 42 | 43.8 |
| 11 | 48 | 9 | 45 | 3 | 40 | 46 | 47.9 |
| 996 | | 315 | | 57 | | 9,431 | |
| 147 | | 93 | | 61 | | 682 | |
| 91 | 61.9 | 62 | 66.3 | 44 | 72.0 | 428 | 62.8 |
| 84 | 57.1 | 54 | 58.0 | 34 | 55.7 | 394 | 57.8 |
| 77 | 52.4 | 48 | 51.6 | 35 | 57.4 | 342 | 50.1 |
| 75 | 51.0 | 45 | 43.4 | 32 | 52.5 | 338 | 49.6 |

evaluators, 57.8%, followed by high school and elementary principals with rates of 50.1 and 49.6%, respectively. Highest evaluator response rates are found in the Great Plains Region, 68%, and the Rocky Mountain Region, 67%. The lowest response rate was from the New England Region, with replies from 51% of the districts.

The greatest principal response was also from the Great Plains Region, with 63% of high school principals responding. Elementary principals' return rates were 60% for the Southeast Region, the Great Plains Region, and the Rocky Mountain Region. Lowest principal responses were found in the Far West Region, where 44% of the high school principals returned questionnaires, and in the Mideast, where returns were received from 43% of the elementary principals.

The overall response rate for each of the eight regions, as shown in Table 5, ranged from a low of 51.0% returned by the New England Region to a high of 77.4% returned by the Great Plains Region, with all but the New England and Far West regions returning over 60%.

Districts were divided into five categories of size based on the number of classroom teachers in the district. School district return rates were similar for the first three size categories. Responses were received from 60.6% of the districts with 20-119 teachers, 60.6% of the districts with 120-249 teachers, and 61.3% of the districts with 250-599 teachers. Districts with 600-1,999 teachers responded at a rate of 66.3%. The highest rate of return was found in districts with 2,000 or more teachers, 72%. It should be noted that all districts in this size category were included in the sample.

## Findings

The sample was randomly drawn to represent all districts in states included in the population, after stratification according to size and region. Districts to be included in the sample were not drawn proportionally from each cell; therefore, it was necessary to apply weights to the responses in each cell. These weights were determined by dividing the number of districts in the population that fell within each cell by the number of responses in that cell. The resulting weight was applied to each response within that cell.

Expansion weights were applied to all data prior to determination of frequencies and descriptive and inferential statistics. Weighting of the data by size of district and by region ensured that the results were representative, in terms of these critical factors, of all districts within the 41 states that were included in the sample. Separate weights, based on the number of responding districts in each cell, were calculated for each of the three data sets (all evaluators and matching principals, high school principals and their evaluators, and elementary principals and their evaluators). These weights are found in Tables 2-4 in Chapter III.

The purpose of this study was 1) to determine the status of the evaluation of principals in the United States, including a) the identification of types of evaluation systems in use, b) the conditions under which these systems operate, and c) the perceived effectiveness of the evaluation system; and 2) to explore the relationships of type and conditions of principal evaluation to perceived effectiveness, and the relationship of size and socioeconomic status of districts and schools to

the type, conditions, and perceived effectiveness of principal evaluation. Descriptive statistics were used to establish the status of principal evaluation, and inferential statistics were used to determine relationships among type, conditions, perceived effectiveness, and demographic characteristics.

Status of principal evaluation

Status, for use in this study, was defined as the degree to which research-based components and supporting practices are used and are perceived as effective in principal evaluation systems, and was determined through investigation of the following: 1) the type of principal evaluation system in use, which includes purpose and frequency of principal evaluation, and the degree to which research-based components and practices are included, 2) the conditions under which the system is implemented, including personal and district characteristics that may impact the district's principal evaluation system, and 3) the effectiveness of the principal evaluation system as perceived by principals and evaluators.

Type of evaluation Responses to questions concerning type of evaluation are found in Tables 6, 7, and 8 and address purpose, frequency, and the degree to which recommended components and practices are included in principal evaluation. In these tables, the responses of all evaluators that could be paired with a principal from the same district are given, followed by responses of high school principals and their evaluators, and elementary school principals and their evaluators.

Responses of high school and elementary principals concerning the purpose and frequency of principal evaluation are presented in Table 6. Principals reported the key purpose of principal evaluation in their district to be accountability (high school, 57%; elementary, 58.7%); growth was reported by evaluators to be the key purpose of principal evaluation (evaluators of high school principals, 50.6%; evaluators of elementary principals, 52.4%).

When asked to indicate all purposes, evaluators and principals were in close agreement concerning the use of evaluation to ensure accountability, but some disagreement existed concerning the acknowledgment of growth as a purpose for principal evaluation in their district. Twenty-four percent of the high school principals and 14.5% of the elementary principals listed growth as one of the purposes for principal evaluation in their district, while evaluators in 82% of the districts identified it. Respondents in all groups were in agreement concerning frequency of the evaluation cycle, with 87.5 to 90.3% reporting that evaluation was conducted annually.

The frequency with which individual components of principal evaluation were applied are presented in Table 7. Overall, principals reported less frequent application of components of successful principal evaluation than did evaluators. A higher frequency of official site visits was reported by evaluators than by high school principals, who, in turn, reported a higher frequency than elementary principals. High school principals in 27.5% of the responding districts and elementary principals in 35.1% of the responding districts reported no official site visits,

Table 6. Purposes and frequency of principal evaluation as reported by evaluator, and evaluator matched with high school and elementary principal

| Characteristics of principal evaluation | Evaluator (N=8951) (%) | High school principal (N=8627) (%) | High school evaluator (N=8789) (%) | Elementary principal (N=8615) (%) | Elementary evaluator (N=8846) (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Key purpose: | | | | | |
| Termination | .9 | 3.5 | 1.0 | 2.2 | .8 |
| Accountability | 45.7 | 57.9 | 45.5 | 58.7 | 44.1 |
| Merit pay | 2.0 | 5.3 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.0 |
| Promotion | .6 | .7 | .7 | .1 | .7 |
| Growth | 50.8 | 32.6 | 50.6 | 36.5 | 52.4 |
| All purposes: | | | | | |
| Termination | 25.9 | 19.9 | 24.9 | 21.8 | 25.9 |
| Accountability | 82.9 | 75.9 | 80.6 | 80.5 | 83.6 |
| Merit pay | 15.6 | 11.7 | 15.8 | 8.5 | 14.3 |
| Promotion | 16.5 | 8.6 | 15.1 | 8.5 | 16.3 |
| Growth | 82.2 | 64.2 | 82.3 | 69.1 | 82.6 |
| Frequency of evaluation: | | | | | |
| Weekly | .0 | .2 | 0 | 1.1 | .0 |
| Monthly | 4.0 | 1.9 | 4.5 | .7 | 4.2 |
| Annually | 87.9 | 87.5 | 87.8 | 90.3 | 88.5 |
| 2 or 3 a year | 8.1 | 10.4 | 7.8 | 8.0 | 7.3 |

Table 7. Percent of districts using research-based components of principal evaluation as reported by evaluator, and evaluator matched with high school and elementary principal

| Components of evaluation | Evaluator (N=8951) (%) | High school principal (N=8627) (%) | High school evaluator (N=8789) (%) | Elementary principal (N=8615) (%) | Elementary evaluator (N=8846) (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Site visits (official): | | | | | |
| None | 18.1 | 27.5 | 17.1 | 35.1 | 19.0 |
| Annual | 23.4 | 34.0 | 23.9 | 30.1 | 24.9 |
| Monthly | 37.8 | 16.6 | 38.5 | 25.6 | 36.0 |
| Weekly | 20.7 | 22.0 | 20.5 | 9.2 | 20.1 |
| Site visits (unofficial): | | | | | |
| None | 1.1 | 7.2 | 1.3 | 8.7 | .8 |
| Annual | 4.0 | 6.1 | 4.5 | 17.1 | 4.4 |
| Monthly | 39.4 | 38.5 | 39.1 | 48.5 | 40.9 |
| Weekly | 55.5 | 48.3 | 55.1 | 25.7 | 54.0 |
| Conferences: | | | | | |
| Never | .4 | 3.9 | .5 | 4.5 | .0 |
| 1 a year | 20.9 | 33.4 | 22.7 | 39.6 | 18.6 |
| 2 a year | 25.6 | 25.4 | 24.3 | 23.6 | 27.2 |
| 3 or more | 53.0 | 37.3 | 52.4 | 32.4 | 54.2 |
| Feedback: | | | | | |
| None | 1.1 | 3.5 | 1.4 | 3.4 | .3 |
| Some | 32.6 | 42.7 | 30.8 | 54.6 | 35.3 |
| Frequent | 66.3 | 53.9 | 67.8 | 41.9 | 64.4 |
| Goals established for principal: | | | | | |
| None | 5.1 | 5.6 | 6.1 | 5.6 | 3.1 |
| Set by evaluator | 2.8 | 4.2 | 2.6 | 4.5 | 2.4 |
| Set by principal | 15.1 | 26.9 | 15.0 | 38.9 | 16.7 |
| Set by both | 77.0 | 63.2 | 76.3 | 51.0 | 77.8 |

while 17.1% of the high school and 19.0% of the elementary evaluators reported the same. High school principals reported more frequent official site visits than were reported by elementary principals. Monthly visits were indicated by 38.5% of the high school evaluators and 36.0% of the elementary evaluators. Annual site visits, most frequently indicated by principals, were reported by 34.0% of the high school principals and 30.1% of the elementary principals.

Unofficial site visits were reported to occur more frequently in high schools, where monthly visits were reported by 38.5% of the principals and weekly visits were reported by 48.3%, than in elementary schools, where monthly visits were reported by 48.5% of the principals and weekly visits were reported by 25.7%. Elementary evaluators, however, reported weekly visits in 54% of the districts.

Conferences were reported to take place three or more times a year by 52.4% of the responding high school evaluators and 54.2% of the responding elementary evaluators, but fewer high school principals (37.3%) and elementary principals (32.4%) reported this degree of frequency. Frequent feedback was reported by principals in 53.9% of the high schools and 41.9% of the elementary schools, but evaluators reported frequent feedback in 67.8% of the high schools and 64.4% of the elementary schools.

Principals and evaluators expressed differing views concerning the establishment of goals for principals. While the majority of the principals and evaluators stated that goals were set jointly, they differed in the amount of support they gave this statement. High school evaluators in 76.3% of the districts and elementary evaluators in 77.8% of

the districts indicated that goals were set by both principal and evaluator. High school principals in 63.2% of the districts reported goals were set by both, and only 51% of the elementary principals reported joint goal-setting.

Type of evaluation is further defined in Table 8. Again, the components of effective evaluation that have been identified by research are addressed, together with practices found to be effective in applying these components. Respondents were asked to choose all answers that apply. Overall, responses of principals indicated a lower incidence of recommended practices than did those of evaluators. Principals and evaluators disagreed concerning site visits within their district. Conferences during site visits were reported by 83.7% of the high school and elementary evaluators, 64.3% of the high school principals, and 65.3% of the elementary principals. Formal observations were reported by 40.1% of the high school evaluators and 39.7% of the elementary evaluators. Only 24% of the high school and 14.5% of the elementary principals indicated the same. Fifteen percent of the high school supervisors reported they shadow principals during site visits, but only 6.8% of the high school principals reported being shadowed. Elementary principals in 11.4% of the districts reported they were shadowed, while 14.8% of the elementary evaluators reported shadowing.

Sixty-one percent of the high school principals and 64.8% of the elementary principals reported their evaluations included both formative and summative conferences, while 80.6% of the high school evaluators and 84.7% of the elementary evaluators reported the same. Supervisors gave a

Table 8. Percent of districts applying recommended practices of principal evaluation systems as reported by all evaluators, and evaluators matched with elementary and high school principals

| Principal evaluation practices | All principal evaluators (N=8951) (%) | High school principal (N=8773) (%) | High school evaluator (N=8848) (%) | Elementary principal (N=8893) (%) | Elementary evaluator (N=8900) (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Site visits include: | | | | | |
| Conversation | 88.9 | 85.5 | 88.5 | 86.8 | 88.9 |
| Shadowing | 14.3 | 6.8 | 15.2 | 11.4 | 14.8 |
| Conferencing | 84.6 | 64.3 | 83.7 | 65.3 | 83.7 |
| Formal observation | 38.6 | 24.0 | 40.1 | 14.5 | 39.7 |
| Conferences: | | | | | |
| Formative | 19.5 | 19.1 | 20.4 | 16.3 | 20.2 |
| Summative | 21.4 | 29.5 | 22.5 | 25.8 | 20.8 |
| Both | 82.5 | 61.0 | 80.6 | 64.8 | 84.7 |
| Feedback: | | | | | |
| Unclear | 5.4 | 13.9 | 5.9 | 15.7 | 4.2 |
| Specific | 58.3 | 48.4 | 58.4 | 43.7 | 57.0 |
| Helpful | 72.4 | 66.3 | 72.1 | 65.2 | 73.8 |
| Goal-related | 66.0 | 53.2 | 66.7 | 55.6 | 68.4 |
| Sources of input: | | | | | |
| Supervisor | 73.8 | 86.8 | 72.9 | 87.4 | 74.2 |
| Peers | 16.7 | 7.8 | 15.4 | 8.2 | 17.2 |
| Teachers | 35.0 | 26.9 | 34.8 | 34.2 | 34.6 |
| Students | 8.8 | 11.7 | 7.1 | 6.3 | 7.5 |
| Parents | 20.6 | 12.0 | 20.2 | 16.0 | 19.6 |
| Portfolio | 12.1 | 3.8 | 12.9 | 4.9 | 13.3 |

Table 8. Continued

| Principal evaluation practices | All principal evaluators (N=8951) (%) | High school principal (N=8773) (%) | High school evaluator (N=8848) (%) | Elementary principal (N=8893) (%) | Elementary evaluator (N=8900) (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Goals: | | | | | |
| Personal | 67.1 | 58.5 | 65.3 | 56.6 | 70.5 |
| Professional | 76.5 | 69.0 | 74.0 | 75.2 | 78.5 |
| Building | 83.0 | 73.1 | 81.9 | 79.8 | 85.7 |
| District | 70.4 | 64.5 | 66.5 | 68.6 | 71.1 |
| Evaluation of supervision of teachers: | | | | | |
| No observation | 65.0 | 70.9 | 65.1 | 72.5 | 61.2 |
| Observe classroom observation | 19.2 | 10.8 | 19.4 | 11.8 | 20.0 |
| Observe post-observation conference | 18.5 | 13.4 | 17.3 | 12.5 | 20.5 |
| Evaluation of curriculum monitoring: | | | | | |
| None | 19.3 | 36.7 | 19.3 | 34.7 | 18.1 |
| Delivery | 47.2 | 26.9 | 47.2 | 26.4 | 47.4 |
| Alignment | 45.9 | 30.8 | 44.2 | 29.6 | 43.9 |
| Test disaggregation | 22.2 | 14.1 | 20.8 | 21.2 | 24.5 |
| Use of test scores for program | 40.9 | 30.9 | 38.6 | 37.5 | 43.7 |

Table 8. Continued

| Principal evaluation practices | All principal evaluators (N=8951) (%) | High school principal (N=8773) (%) | High school evaluator (N=8848) (%) | Elementary principal (N=8893) (%) | Elementary evaluator (N=8900) (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Professional development: | | | | | |
| None | 4.1 | 7.9 | 5.0 | 9.4 | 3.2 |
| Administration inservice | 84.1 | 71.4 | 85.4 | 71.2 | 84.5 |
| Peer support group | 35.6 | 25.4 | 33.7 | 29.9 | 35.4 |
| University courses | 52.5 | 46.6 | 51.1 | 46.8 | 54.6 |
| Professional workshops | 88.8 | 86.7 | 89.5 | 83.7 | 91.1 |
| Conferences | 83.9 | 81.5 | 84.5 | 78.6 | 85.5 |

higher rating to the quality of feedback than did principals. Feedback was reported to be helpful by 66.3% of the high school principals, and 53.2% reported it was goal related. Seventy-two percent of the high school evaluators found feedback helpful, and 66.7% found it to be goal related. Similar opinions were reported by elementary principals, 65.2% who found feedback helpful and 55.6% who found it goal-related. Seventy-three and eight-tenths percent of their evaluators found it helpful and 68.4% found it goal-related. Unclear feedback was reported by 5.9% of the high school evaluators, 4.2% of the elementary evaluators, 13.9% of the high school principals, and 15.7% of the elementary principals.

Principals and administrators indicated relative agreement concerning sources of input used in principal evaluation. Evaluators of principals indicated greater use of peer input in their principal evaluation system (high school, 15.4%; elementary, 17.2%) than was indicated by principals (high school, 7.9%; elementary, 8.2%). Teacher input was reported by evaluators of high school (34.8%) and elementary (34.6%) principals. High school principals in 26.9% of the districts reported use of teacher input; 34.2% of the elementary principals reported the same. Parent input was reported by evaluators of high school and elementary principals in 20.2 and 19.6% of the districts, respectively, but only 12% of the responding high school principals and 16% of the elementary principals reported use of parent input. Use of portfolios to evaluate principals was minimal, reported by 3.8% of the high school principals and 4.9% of the elementary principals. Evaluators reported a slightly higher use of portfolios.

Agreement was relatively high among all responding groups concerning the type of goals set for principals. A greater number of elementary principals reported use of professional goals (75.2%), building goals (79.8%), and district goals (68.6%) in the principal evaluation process than did high school principals of whom 69% reported the use of professional goals, 73.1% reported the use of building goals, and 64.5% reported the use of district goals. Responses of evaluators were slightly higher than those of principals for the same categories.

Two questions dealt directly with instructional leadership. The first investigated the extent the principal evaluator directly observed the process of teacher evaluation. The second involved the degree various aspects of curriculum monitoring were included in principal evaluation. Most respondents reported that no observation was made of the teacher evaluation process (high school principals, 70%; high school evaluators, 65.1%; elementary principals, 72.5%; elementary evaluators, 61.2%). High school and elementary principals in 11 to 13% of the districts reported that classroom observation and post-observation conferences were included in the principal evaluation process of their district. Evaluators reported a higher occurrence, ranging from 17 to 21%.

The second question concerned with instructional leadership addressed the extent to which principals were evaluated on several aspects of curriculum monitoring. Forty-seven percent of the evaluators reported monitoring of curriculum delivery was included in their district's principal evaluation system, but only 27% of the principals reported that they were evaluated on this aspect. Monitoring of curriculum alignment

was reported to be included by 44% of the evaluators and 30% of the principals. Evaluation of appropriate use of test scores was reported by both evaluators and principals to be lower in high schools than in elementary schools. Evaluation of disaggregation of test scores was reported by 14.1% of the high school principals, 20.8% of their evaluators, 21.2% of the elementary principals, and 24.5% of their evaluators. Evaluation of the use of test scores for program adjustment was reported by 30.9% of the high school principals, 38.6% of the high school evaluators, 37.5% of the elementary principals, and 43.7% of their evaluators.

Professional development opportunities that were investigated included those provided within the district and those available outside the district. High school and elementary evaluators reported that administrative inservice was available in 35% of the districts, but only 71% of the principals reported the same service. The existence of peer support groups was reported by 33.7% of the responding high school principals and 35.4% of the elementary principals. Elementary principals showed greater disagreement on items concerning outside sources of development than did high school principals. Evaluators indicated a slightly higher use of university courses than principals, as well as workshops and conferences.

Conditions of evaluation Conditions under which evaluation takes place are divided into two categories and are found in Tables 9 and 10. The first category is comprised of characteristics of the respondents that may impact evaluation; the second includes characteristics of the district

system that may impact the evaluation of principals. Responses of all evaluators that could be paired with a principal from the same district are given, followed by responses of high school principals and their evaluators, and elementary school principals and their evaluators.

Elementary principals within the sample were older than high school principals, as seen in Table 9, and both groups were younger than evaluators. Principals and evaluators were predominately male, with 16% choosing not to identify gender. Twenty-five to 27% of the responding principals and evaluators have been in their present position for 1 to 2 years, while 30-32% have been in their position for 3 to 5 years. Over half of all respondents have been in their present position for 5 years or less. Seventeen to 25% have been in their present position for 6 to 10 years. Evaluators indicated a higher degree of total experience than principals, with 19.2% reporting 25 or more years of experience, compared to 7.7% and 7.5% of the high school and elementary principals reporting the same degree of experience. Evaluators reported more experience with the evaluation system used in their district than did principals. However, 20.2% of the evaluators, 26.3% of the high school principals, and 28.8% of the elementary principals reported 2 or less years of experience with the principal evaluation system used in their district.

Characteristics of districts that may impact principal evaluation are seen in Table 10. Relatively new principal evaluation systems, still in the first 3 years of existence, were found in 21% of the districts, systems in place for 4 to 7 years were found in 45.2% of the districts, and 25% of the districts reported a system in place for 10 or more years.

Table 9. Percent of evaluators and principals reporting demographic data

| Demographic categories | Evaluator (N=9309) (%) | High school principal (N=9254) (%) | Elementary principal (N=9228) (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Age of evaluator and principal: | | | |
| 25-29 | .6 | .5 | .5 |
| 30-34 | .7 | 2.3 | 7.6 |
| 35-40 | 3.1 | 10.7 | 7.1 |
| 41-44 | 12.8 | 22.6 | 21.6 |
| 45-50 | 28.0 | 28.9 | 24.6 |
| 51-54 | 25.7 | 17.2 | 21.7 |
| 55-59 | 18.1 | 12.9 | 10.2 |
| 60+ | 11.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Gender: | | | |
| Female | 75.8 | 75.0 | 76.9 |
| Male | 7.2 | 9.0 | 7.1 |
| No answer | 17.0 | 15.9 | 16.0 |
| Experience in present position: | | | |
| 1-2 | 26.9 | 25.4 | 27.3 |
| 3-5 | 30.0 | 31.8 | 31.2 |
| 6-10 | 25.4 | 17.3 | 21.8 |
| 11-15 | 6.3 | 8.3 | 9.1 |
| 16-20 | 3.6 | 7.8 | 3.4 |
| 21-25 | 1.9 | 3.2 | 1.3 |
| 25+ | 5.9 | 6.2 | 5.8 |
| Total experiences as evaluator/principal: | | | |
| 1-2 | 10.0 | 13.5 | 12.4 |
| 3-5 | 15.6 | 23.7 | 23.1 |
| 6-10 | 20.3 | 26.9 | 21.1 |
| 11-15 | 17.5 | 13.1 | 18.2 |
| 16-20 | 11.4 | 11.2 | 11.1 |
| 21-25 | 6.1 | 4.0 | 6.5 |
| 25+ | 19.2 | 7.7 | 7.5 |
| Experience with this evaluation system: | | | |
| None | 2.8 | 3.8 | 3.7 |
| 1-2 | 17.4 | 22.5 | 25.1 |
| 3-5 | 23.4 | 29.0 | 30.4 |
| 6-9 | 25.1 | 18.6 | 18.5 |
| 10+ | 31.3 | 26.1 | 22.3 |

Table 10. Percent of districts indicating organizational demographics as reported by evaluators and principals

| Organizational demographics | Evaluator (N=9309) (%) | High school principal (N=9254) (%) | Elementary principal (N=9228) (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Organizational structure: | | | |
| Centralized | -- | 29.7 | 22.9 |
| Some site-based decisions | -- | 65.0 | 72.9 |
| All site-based decisions | -- | 5.3 | 4.2 |
| Years system has been in place: | | | |
| 1 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 |
| 2-3 | 15.5 | 15.5 | 15.5 |
| 4-5 | 24.8 | 24.8 | 24.8 |
| 6-7 | 20.4 | 20.4 | 20.4 |
| 8-9 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 8.9 |
| 10+ | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| Training of evaluator and principal: | | | |
| None | 2.5 | 2.8 | 5.0 |
| Very little | 7.8 | 8.4 | 11.2 |
| Some | 56.9 | 54.9 | 51.7 |
| Intensive | 32.5 | 33.9 | 32.2 |
| Span of control: | | | |
| 1-5 | 67.5 | -- | -- |
| 6-10 | 21.3 | -- | -- |
| 11-15 | 6.9 | -- | -- |
| 16-20 | 2.0 | -- | -- |
| 21-30 | 2.3 | -- | -- |
| Percent of time spent evaluating principals: | | | |
| 1-10 | 68.4 | -- | -- |
| 11-20 | 9.8 | -- | -- |
| 21-30 | 2.5 | -- | -- |
| 31-40 | .3 | -- | -- |
| 41-50 | .5 | -- | -- |
| 51-60 | .1 | -- | -- |
| No answer | 18.5 | -- | -- |
| Compensation: | | | |
| None | 41.0 | -- | -- |
| Other (than merit pay) | 40.3 | -- | -- |
| Considering merit pay | 4.8 | -- | -- |
| Merit pay in place | 13.9 | -- | -- |

Most respondents reported they had received training, and principals and evaluators were in general agreement as to the amount of training received. Some training was reported by 51.7 to 56.9% of the respondents, and 32.5 to 33.9% of the respondents reported intensive training.

Perceived effectiveness Six facets based on literature and research concerning expectations held for principal evaluation were used to describe perceived effectiveness and are found in Table 11. These include the ability of the principal evaluation system to effectively 1) identify problems, 2) improve performance, 3) foster growth, 4) increase communication, 5) monitor accountability, and 6) impact student achievement, and consists of scores on a five-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, and 5=strongly agree).

Average of all facets of effectiveness was higher for evaluators (3.67) than for high school principals (3.40) and elementary principals (3.32). These averages placed evaluators in the low range of "agree" when reacting to the statement that their district's principal evaluation system is effective, and places high school and elementary principals in the "neutral" category between agree and disagree. Evaluators ranked their district's principal evaluation system higher on individual facets of effectiveness than did principals, from .17 to .39 higher than high school principals, and from .19 to .50 higher than elementary principals. In spite of this difference in actual means, the ranking of mean scores of these facets within the three response groups was similar. The ability of the evaluation system to foster growth was ranked first or second by all

Table 11. Perception of effectiveness of principal evaluation system by facets of effectiveness and position of respondent

| Facets of effectiveness | Evaluator (N=8816) | | High school principal (N=8689) | | Elementary principal (N=8702) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean[a] | S.D. | Mean[a] | S.D. | Mean[a] | S.D. |
| **The district's evaluation system effectively:** | | | | | | |
| Identifies problems | 3.75 | .87 | 3.39 | 1.07 | 3.25 | 1.04 |
| Improves performance | 3.72 | .87 | 3.39 | 1.08 | 3.34 | 1.05 |
| Fosters growth | 3.79 | .86 | 3.53 | 1.09 | 3.49 | 1.01 |
| Increases communication | 3.86 | .93 | 3.53 | 1.11 | 3.37 | 1.15 |
| Monitors accountability | 3.65 | .91 | 3.46 | 1.06 | 3.39 | 1.04 |
| Impacts student achievement | 3.26 | 1.00 | 3.09 | 1.00 | 3.07 | 1.02 |
| Total | 3.67 | | 3.40 | | 3.32 | |

[a]1=Strongly disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly agree.

groups. The ability of the system to monitor accountability was ranked second by elementary principals, third by high school principals, and fifth by evaluators. The ability of the system to impact students' achievement was ranked sixth by all responding groups.

It should be noted that even the highest rankings did not indicate a high level of confidence on the part of any of the three response groups in the district's principal evaluation system. Highest confidence in the ability of the evaluation system to effectively foster growth was indicated by evaluators responding with a mean score of 3.79, followed by high school principals with a mean score of 3.53, and elementary principals with a mean score of 3.49. Likewise, evaluators indicated the highest confidence of the three groups in the ability of the system to monitor accountability, with a mean score of 3.65, followed by high school principals with a mean score of 3.46 and elementary principals with a mean score of 3.39. Mean scores for the three groups concerning the ability of the principal evaluation system to impact student achievement were much lower but followed a similar pattern (evaluators, 3.26; high school principals, 3.09; elementary principals, 3.07). Evaluators (3.86) and high school principals (3.53) felt their district evaluation system was somewhat effective in increasing communication between evaluator and principal, but elementary principals showed less support, with a mean of 3.37. Variance among principals' scores is greater than that of evaluators with standard deviations ranging from 1.00 to 1.15 for principals, and .86 to 1.00 for evaluators.

In spite of similar ranking given by all groups to the facets of effectiveness, discrepancies between means of evaluators and principals were evident. The greatest difference between evaluators and high school principals was in their assessment of the ability of the system to identify problems, with a difference of .36 points, and its ability to improve performance and increase communication, each with a difference of .33. By comparison, disagreement between evaluators and elementary principals equaled or exceeded .30 on all facets, with the exception of the ability of the system to monitor accountability, and its ability to impact student achievement. The highest area of disagreement between evaluators and elementary principals was in the ability of the system to identify problems, with a difference of .50, its ability to reflect daily responsibilities, and its ability to increase communication, both with a difference of .49.

The differences in mean scores of evaluators, high school principals, and elementary principals, as seen in this and other tables, are useful in recognizing variations between groups and within groups. For this reason they have been included in the discussion of the findings. They are not, however, directly related to the research question and, therefore, have not been analyzed to determine their statistical significance.

Beliefs in principals and evaluators concerning the ability of principals to impact the quality of teaching and learning within the district are presented in Table 12. The mean scores represent responses to a five-point Likert scale and indicate both evaluators and principals

Table 12. Dimensions of efficacy of principals and evaluators

| Dimensions of efficacy | Principal evaluator (N=9281) Mean[a] | S.D. | High school principal (N=9254) Mean[a] | S.D. | Elementary principal (N=9107) Mean[a] | S.D. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Principals can:** | | | | | | |
| Influence student outcomes. | 4.62 | .64 | 4.36 | .68 | 4.45 | .60 |
| Determine success of implementation of district programs. | 4.42 | .68 | 4.08 | .79 | 4.17 | .75 |
| Improve building climate. | 4.68 | .57 | 4.46 | .68 | 4.53 | .68 |
| Influence values and beliefs of teachers concerning teaching and learning. | 4.34 | .77 | 4.10 | .71 | 4.15 | .73 |
| Improve quality of teaching and learning within his/her building. | 4.49 | .64 | 4.23 | .66 | 4.29 | .64 |
| Total | 4.51 | | 4.25 | | 4.32 | |
| **I can:** | | | | | | |
| Improve teaching and learning in this building. | 4.15 | .70 | 4.17 | .66 | 4.28 | .67 |
| Impact the values and beliefs of teachers. | 3.88 | .80 | 3.98 | .81 | 4.09 | .76 |
| Successfully implement district programs. | 4.30 | .65 | 3.93 | .57 | 3.98 | .63 |
| Total | 4.11 | | 4.03 | | 4.12 | |

[a]1=Strongly disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly agree.

have confidence in the ability of principals to impact school effectiveness.

Questions were divided into two sections, the first referring to general efficacy of all principals and the second referring to personal efficacy as expressed by principals and evaluators. Evaluators indicated highest confidence in the ability of principals, in general, to impact teaching and learning, with an average mean score of 4.51 followed by elementary principals with an average mean score of 4.32 and high school principals with an average mean score of 4.25. Standard deviations were similar for all groups ranging from .57 to .77 on individual facets. Personal efficacy mean scores ranging from 3.88 to 4.17 for all groups on individual facets were lower than those for general efficacy. Both sets of scores display confidence in the efficacy of principals and are useful when compared to the lack of confidence they place in their principal evaluation system to support them in achieving this efficacy.

Relationships among factors of principal evaluation

The relationships among type of evaluation, conditions of evaluation, perceived effectiveness, and demographic characteristics of the district are determined through use of the following research questions: 1) What relationship, if any, exists between the perceived effectiveness of a district's system of principal evaluation and the type of system in use? 2) What relationship, if any, exists between the perceived effectiveness of a district's system of principal evaluation and the conditions under which the system is applied? 3) What relationship, if any, exists between

the perceived effectiveness, type and conditions of a district's system of principal evaluation, and the size and socioeconomic status of the district and school? The first two questions were answered through the application of multiple regression analysis using the PC CARP statistical package. The SPSS statistical package was used to answer the third question.

Perceived effectiveness and type The following null hypothesis was used to answer the first research question: No relationship exists between perceived effectiveness of a district's system of principal evaluation and type of evaluation employed by the district. The sum of the six individual facets of perceived effectiveness provided the first construct, which became the dependent variable. The second construct, type of principal evaluation system, was defined using eight components of principal evaluation identified by research. The score for each component was determined by combining the frequency applied within the district and number of recommended practices used to support it. Mean scores for these components are seen in Table 13. These components became the independent variables in the regression analysis and were tested to determine their ability to predict the effectiveness of the system as perceived by evaluators and principals. The hypothesis was applied to each of the three data sets and tested using a multiple regression analysis. The results are found in Tables 14-16 and show the following:

**Evaluators**: The result of the application of a multiple regression analysis to data contributed by evaluators was the rejection, at the .05 level of significance, of the null hypothesis. Components of "type of

Table 13. Type of principal evaluation system by components of system and position of respondent

| Components of type of evaluation | Evaluator (N=8816) | | High school principal (N=8689) | | Elementary principal (N=8702) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean[a] | S.D. | Mean[a] | S.D. | Mean[a] | S.D. |
| Goals | 5.97 | 1.81 | 5.81 | 1.51 | 5.64 | 1.50 |
| Conferences | 5.29 | 1.88 | 5.52 | 1.57 | 5.32 | 2.33 |
| Site visits | 5.61 | 2.02 | 5.25 | 1.98 | 4.65 | 1.89 |
| Feedback | 4.40 | 1.47 | 4.24 | 1.31 | 4.08 | 1.82 |
| Sources of input | 3.70 | 1.42 | 3.44 | 1.35 | 3.61 | 1.31 |
| Instructional leadership | 1.86 | 1.61 | 1.29 | 1.45 | 1.40 | 1.44 |
| Professional development | 1.44 | 1.07 | 1.19 | .93 | 1.15 | .92 |

[a]1=Strongly disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly agree.

Table 14. Multiple regression of components of principal evaluation with evaluators' perceived effectiveness of evaluation as dependent variable

| Independent variables | B | $R^2$ | df | F | Prob. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Instructional leadership | 1.25** | .41 | 7,36 | 20.632 | .001** |
| Feedback | 1.18* | | | | |
| Sources of input | .92 | | | | |
| Site visits | .90 | | | | |
| Goals | .68 | | | | |
| Professional development | -.63 | | | | |
| Conferences | -.25 | | | | |

*Significant at $p<.05$.

**Significant at $p<.01$.

Table 15. Multiple regression of components of principal evaluation with high school principals' perceived effectiveness of evaluation as dependent variable

| Independent variables | B | $R^2$ | df | F | Prob. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Conferences | .29 | .02 | 7,36 | 2.7278 | .05 |
| Professional development | .23 | | | | |
| Instructional leadership | -.20 | | | | |
| Feedback | -.08 | | | | |
| Sources of input | -.07 | | | | |
| Site visits | .02 | | | | |
| Goals | .01 | | | | |

Table 16. Multiple regression of components of principal evaluation with elementary principals' perceived effectiveness of evaluation as dependent variable

| Independent variables | B | $R^2$ | df | F | Prob. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Instructional leadership | .23 | .02 | 7,35 | 1.26 | >.25 |
| Sources of input | .21 | | | | |
| Feedback | -.17 | | | | |
| Professional development | -.12 | | | | |
| Site visits | .09 | | | | |
| Goals | -.09 | | | | |
| Conferences | -.01 | | | | |

evaluation" found to contribute to perceived effectiveness were 1) the direct evaluation of instructional leadership, and 2) feedback which was considered to be frequent, specific, helpful, and goal related (as reported by evaluators). Both components contributed positively and together they accounted for 40% of the variance found in the responses to perceived effectiveness.

**High school principals:** The results of the application of a multiple regression analysis to data contributed by high school principals was the retention at the .05 level of significance of the null hypothesis. No components of type of evaluation as reported by high school principals were found to contribute to perceived effectiveness.

**Elementary principals:** The results of the application of a multiple regression analysis to data contributed by elementary principals was the retention at the .05 level of significance of the null hypothesis. No components of type of evaluation as reported by elementary principals were found to contribute to perceived effectiveness.

Perceived effectiveness and conditions The second research question was tested using the following null hypothesis: No relationship exists between perceived effectiveness of a district's system of principal evaluation and conditions of evaluation employed by the district. Conditions of evaluation included characteristics of respondents and of the district evaluation system that may impact the effectiveness of the evaluation system. Mean scores for these characteristics are found in Table 17. These characteristics became the independent variables in the regression analysis. This hypothesis was applied to each of the data sets

Table 17. Conditions of principal evaluation system by position of respondent

| Conditions of evaluation | Evaluator (N=8816) Mean[a] | S.D. |
|---|---|---|
| Degree of decentralization | 1.56 | 1.14 |
| Years in place | 4.12 | 1.90 |
| Training of principal | 3.10 | 2.08 |
| Training of evaluator | 3.42 | 1.54 |
| Span of control | 1.82 | 1.82 |
| Percent of evaluator's time | 25.36[b] | 1.15 |
| Compensation | 3.41 | 2.34 |

[a]1=Strongly disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly agree.

[b]Mean percent.

and tested using a multiple regression analysis. The results are found in Table 18 and show the following:

**Evaluators:** The result of the application of a multiple regression analysis to data contributed by evaluators was the rejection, at the .05 level of significance, of the null hypothesis. Individual conditions found to contribute to perceived effectiveness were 1) degree of decentralization within the district organization as reported by principals, 2) span of control used in principal supervision, and 3) the number of years that the current system had been in place. Together these conditions accounted for 26% of the variance found in responses to perceived effectiveness. The degree of decentralization contributed positively while span of control and years the current system was in place contributed negatively.

Demographics and perceived effectiveness, type, and conditions

The third research question was tested using the following null hypothesis: No relationship exists between demographic characteristics and the type, conditions, and perceived effectiveness of the school and district. The relationships were investigated using the Pearson product-moment method of analysis. Size was determined by the number of students in the district and the number of students in the building of the principal responding. Three measures of socioeconomic status were used: 1) cost per pupil, which was determined by dividing the operating budget by the number of students, 2) number of students in the district that qualify for free and reduced lunch, and 3) number of students in the responding principal's building that qualify for free and reduced lunch.

Table 18. Multiple regression of conditions of principal evaluation with evaluators' perceived effectiveness of evaluation as a dependent variable

| Independent variables | B | $R^2$ | df | F | Prob. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Degree of decentralization | 1.09** | .26 | 7,36 | 44.41 | .001 |
| Span of control | -1.09* | | | | |
| Years in place | -.75* | | | | |
| Training of principal | -.69 | | | | |
| Compensation | -.31 | | | | |
| Training of evaluator | -.09 | | | | |
| Percent of evaluator's time | -.01 | | | | |

*Significant at $p<.05$.

**Significant at $p<.01$.

These five demographic measures were compared with the seven components used to define type of evaluation, seven selected characteristics used to define conditions, and the seven facets of perceived effectiveness. Type, conditions, and effectiveness were compared using the responses of evaluators, those of high school principals, and those of elementary principals. The results of these analyses are found in Tables 19-21.

Comparison of type and demographic characteristics yielded many correlations that were statistically significant, but the size of these correlations was very small, ranging from -.01 to .31, and it is doubtful they can be considered of any practical significance. Site visits were negatively correlated to number of students in the district at -.12, -.16, and -.09 as reported by evaluators, high school principals, and elementary principals, respectively. Site visits as recorded by high school principals were negatively related to number of students in the building at -.23. Site visits at high schools were positively related to the number of students qualifying for free lunch at .31. Sources of input as reported by high school principals were positively correlated to cost per pupil with a ratio of .21. Professional development (.31) and monitoring of instructional leadership (.28) as reported by high school principals were positively related to the percent of district students that qualify for free and reduced lunch. Goals for principals were negatively correlated to number of students in the building that qualify for free and reduced lunch (evaluators, -.17; high school principals, -.16; and elementary principals, -.03).

Table 19. Relationship of size and socioeconomic status to type of evaluation by evaluator, high school principal, and elementary principal

| Facets of evaluation | Size | | Socioeconomic status | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of students (District) | Number of students (Building) | Cost per pupil | % Students free/reduced lunch (District) | % Students free\reduced lunch (School) |
| **Reported by evaluator:** | | | | | |
| Site visits | -.1157** | | .0253* | | .0385** |
| Conferences | .0205 | | .1042** | | -.0957** |
| Feedback | .1273 | | .1273** | | .0147 |
| Goals for principal | .1043** | | .0827** | | -.1736** |
| Sources | .0859** | | .0542** | | -.0768** |
| Professional development | .0252* | | -.0328** | | .0622** |
| Instructional leadership | .1042** | | .0088 | | -.0144 |
| **Reported by high school principal:** | | | | | |
| Site visits | -.1652** | -.2313** | .0099 | .1680** | .2182 |
| Conferences | .0524** | .0984** | .0869** | .0843** | .0843 |
| Feedback | .0509** | .0649** | .1928** | .0042 | .0383 |
| Goals for principal | .0285* | .0376** | .1186** | -.1610** | -.1641 |
| Sources | .0686** | .1533** | .204** | -.1338** | -.1039 |
| Professional development | -.0297* | .0347** | -.1491** | .3118** | .3313 |
| Instructional leadership | -.0242 | .0292 | -.0450** | .2772** | .2230 |

*Significant at p<.05.

**Significant at p<.01.

Table 19. Continued

| Facets of evaluation | Size | | Socioeconomic status | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of students (District) | Number of students (Building) | Cost per pupil | % Students free/reduced lunch (District) | % Students free\reduced lunch (School) |
| **Reported by elementary principal:** | | | | | |
| Site visits | -.0934** | -.0047 | .0018 | .2120** | .2169** |
| Conferences | .0275* | -.0274* | .0715** | .0743** | .1011** |
| Feedback | -.0228 | -.0857** | .0600** | .2300** | .1795** |
| Goals for principal | .0633** | .0027 | .1344** | -.0161* | -.0296* |
| Sources | .0551** | -.0583** | .0970** | .0733** | -.0354** |
| Professional development | -.0724** | -.0884** | .0646** | .2174** | .1300** |
| Instructional leadership | -.0224 | -.0086 | .0809** | .2072** | .1480** |

Table 20. Relationship of size and socioeconomic status to conditions of evaluation by evaluator, high school principal, and elementary principal

| Conditions | Size | | Socioeconomic status | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of students (District) | Number of students (Building) | Cost per pupil | % Students free/reduced lunch (District) | % Students free\reduced lunch (School) |
| **Reported by evaluator:** | | | | | |
| Organization | .0626** | | .0268* | | .0392** |
| System in place | .0665** | | -.0446** | | -.0156 |
| Training of evaluator | -.0116 | | .0821** | | .0960** |
| Training of principal | .0239* | | .1147** | | -.0810** |
| Span of control | .5502** | | -.0634** | | -.0782** |
| Percent of time evaluating | .2241** | | -.0854** | | .1465** |
| Compensation | .0465** | | .0858** | | -.0872** |
| **Reported by high school principal:** | | | | | |
| Organization | .0459** | .1594** | .1092** | .0748** | -.0245 |
| System in place | .1114** | .0801** | .0872** | .0324* | -.0304* |
| Training of evaluator | -.0087 | .0573** | -.0403** | .1363** | .1615** |
| Training of principal | .0007 | .0995** | .0940** | .1893** | .1188** |
| Span of control | .6297** | .5090** | -.0700** | .0520** | -.1077** |
| Percent of time evaluating | .2905** | .2423** | .0088 | .1299** | .0131 |
| Compensation | .0250 | .1237** | .3764** | -.0802** | -.0257 |

*Significant at $p<.05$.

**Significant at $p<.01$.

Table 20. Continued

| Conditions | Size | | Socioeconomic status | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of students (District) | Number of students (Building) | Cost per pupil | % Students free/reduced lunch (District) | % Students free\reduced lunch (School) |
| **Reported by elementary principal:** | | | | | |
| Organization | -.0201 | .0921** | -.1146** | -.0171 | -.0085 |
| System in place | .1035** | .0667** | -.0269* | -.0134 | -.0350** |
| Training of evaluator | -.0058 | -.0523** | .0633** | .1339** | .1247** |
| Training of principal | .0176 | -.0136 | -.0193 | .1156** | .1207** |
| Span of control | .5198** | .1664** | -.0698** | .0686** | -.0121 |
| Percent of time evaluating | .2239** | -.0553** | -.0775** | .1109** | .1775** |
| Compensation | -.0078 | -.0506** | -.0045 | -.1583** | -.0574** |

Table 21. Relationship of size and socioeconomic status to effectiveness, as perceived by evaluator, high school principal, and elementary principal

| Effectiveness of evaluation | Size | | Socioeconomic status | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of students (District) | Number of students (Building) | Cost per pupil | % Students free/reduced lunch (District) | % Students free\reduced lunch (School) |
| **Reported by evaluator:** | | | | | |
| Identifies problems | .0148 | | .0472** | | -.0566** |
| Improves performance | .0109 | | .0541** | | .0277* |
| Fosters growth | .0527** | | .0497** | | -.0111 |
| Increases communication | .0121 | | .0443** | | -.0700** |
| Monitors accountability | .0103 | | .0397** | | -.0122 |
| Impacts student achievement | .0372** | | -.0011 | | .0177 |
| **Reported by high school principal:** | | | | | |
| Identifies problems | .0218 | .0585** | .0968** | .0075 | .0245 |
| Improves performance | .0430** | .0879** | .1662** | .0037 | .0523** |
| Fosters growth | .0323* | .1326** | .1812** | -.0046 | -.0837** |
| Increases communication | .0442** | .0628** | .1777** | .0189 | .0596** |
| Monitors accountability | .0140 | .010 | .1330** | .0565** | .0404** |
| Impacts student achievement | .0339** | .0127 | .1423** | .0474** | .1060** |

*Significant at $p<.05$.

**Significant at $p<.01$.

Table 21. Continued

| Effectiveness of evaluation | Size | | Socioeconomic status | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of students (District) | Number of students (Building) | Cost per pupil | % Students free/reduced lunch (District) | % Students free\reduced lunch (School) |
| **Reported by elementary principal:** | | | | | |
| Identifies problems | .0305* | -.0272* | .1549** | .1721** | .1601** |
| Improves performance | .0250 | -.0295* | .1529** | .1750** | .1522** |
| Fosters growth | .0522** | -.0178 | .0522** | .1263** | .1220** |
| Increases communication | .0184** | -.0132 | .1340** | .1386** | .1077** |
| Monitors accountability | .0369 | .0028 | .1112** | .1107** | .1828** |
| Impacts student achievement | .0291* | .0250* | .0447** | .2056** | .1654** |

# CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Principals of effective schools, researchers have found, function as instructional leaders within their schools. The milieu of reform in which schools have operated during the '80s has served to heighten interest in these findings concerning the role of the principal and increased the demand that districts hold principals accountable for providing this leadership. Simultaneously, interest in clinical supervision of principals as a means of support for their continuous development has increased dramatically. A combination of formative and summative evaluation was seen as the most effective way to provide accountability and facilitate professional growth of principals, to the end that quality teaching and learning is provided to all students within the district. A result of this increased interest in the accountability and growth of principals was the development of principal evaluation models designed to meet both requirements.

A second result was a legislative mandate in each of 50 states that principals be evaluated. These mandates varied in the degree of specificity of demands, and most did not provide for monitoring of compliance or evaluation of resulting practices. The development and implementation of principal evaluation models resulted, yet research addressing the effectiveness of principal evaluation systems has been scarce and limited to individual states. To date no comprehensive attempt has been made to determine the extent to which research-based components of principal evaluation models and practices which support these

components have been implemented in the nation's schools. Nor has a comprehensive attempt been made to investigate the perceptions that key players hold concerning the effectiveness of principal evaluation within their district.

## Summary--Overview of the Study

The purpose of this investigation was to determine the status of principal evaluation within the United States, including types of systems in use, conditions under which these systems were implemented, and their effectiveness as perceived by principals and evaluators. In addition, this study sought to establish relationships among type, conditions, perceived effectiveness and size, and socioeconomic status of schools and districts. An instrument based on current models of principal evaluation and characteristics of effective organizational structure and change was developed to gather data.

This study was part of an ongoing national investigation of personnel evaluation systems in use throughout the United States. The population of the study was comprised of 9,760 school districts in the 41 states having no state-mandated system of teacher evaluation at the time that the sample was drawn. States omitted from the population were Alabama, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, North and South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. From this population, a sample of 682 districts was randomly selected following stratification of all districts within the population by size and region. An initial mailing to all districts within the sample and a

second mailing to all nonresponding districts resulted in 428 replies, or 62% of the sample.

Status of principal evaluation

The status of principal evaluation in the United States was established through investigation of the following constructs: 1) type of evaluation, including purpose and frequency, and the degree to which research-based components and supportive practices were incorporated into the plan, 2) conditions under which the evaluation was administered, including characteristics of principals, evaluators, and districts that might impact the evaluation of principals, and 3) the effectiveness of the evaluation system as perceived by principals and their evaluators.

Recent models of principal evaluation, developed to ensure accountability and facilitate growth, included several common components believed to result in effective clinical evaluation systems. The construct "type of evaluation" was determined by measuring the frequency these components were applied within school districts that were samples, and the degree to which practices that support these components were in existence. Among the components used to define type of evaluation were official and unofficial site visits, conferences, feedback, goal-setting, multiple sources of input, professional development, and direct monitoring of instructional leadership.

Conditions external to the type of evaluation systems in use have the potential to impact the effectiveness of the system. The construct "conditions of evaluation" was designed to investigate these conditions,

and included 1) characteristics of the respondent, including years of experience in his/her present position, overall experience as a principal or evaluator, experience with the present principal evaluation system, training of evaluator in use of the system, and training of principal in use of the system; and 2) characteristics of the district, including years the system has been in place, number of principals evaluated by the supervisor, the percent of time that evaluators spent on this responsibility, type of compensation connected to the evaluation system, and the degree of decentralization in the organizational structure of the district.

The literature identified expectations, some traditional and others resulting from recent educational reforms, currently applied to principal evaluation. These expectations are the basis for the six facets which comprise the construct of perceived effectiveness. They include the ability of the principal evaluation system to effectively measure behavior, identify problems, improve performance, support growth, improve communication, provide accountability, and impact student achievement.

Among findings emerging from this study that contribute to the determination of the status of principal evaluation in the United States are the following:

1. Type of evaluation:
    - Purpose - Evaluators (51%) indicated that growth was the prime objective of the district's principal evaluation system; principals (58%) indicated that the prime objective was accountability.

- Site visits - Twenty-eight percent of the high school principals and 35% of the elementary principals reported no official site visits. Annual visits were reported by 34% of the high school principals, 30% of the elementary principals, and 24% of the evaluators. Monthly visits were reported by 17% of the high school principals, 26% of the elementary principals, and 39 and 36% of the high school and elementary evaluators, respectively. Unofficial site visits were reported by half of the high school principals to occur weekly. Twenty-five percent of the elementary principals reported the same.
- Conferences - Principals from 33% of the high schools and 60% of the elementary schools reported conferences only once a year. Half of the evaluators reported three or more conferences a year; one-third of the principals reported the same number. Sixty-one percent of the high school principals and 65% of the elementary principals reported both formative and summative conferences; 81% of the high school evaluators and 86% of the elementary evaluators reported the use of both types.
- Evaluative feedback was reported as follows:

  Principals - frequent, 54% (high school) and 42% (elementary); specific, 46%; helpful, 66%.

  Evaluators - frequent, 66%; specific, 58%; helpful, 73%.
- Goals - Principals were responsible for goal setting either independently or in cooperation with their evaluator in 91%

(high school) to 94% (elementary school) of the districts, as reported by evaluators. This included building goals, 76%; district goals, 67%; professional goals, 72%; and personal goals, 58%.

- Instructional leadership - Seventy-one percent of the principals reported no direct observation of teacher evaluation as part of the principal evaluation process in their district; 63% of the evaluators reported the same.
- Thirty-three percent of the districts reported no evaluation of curriculum monitoring. Twenty-six percent of the principals and 18% of the evaluators reported that monitoring of instructional delivery was included in the principal evaluation system. Thirty percent of the high school principals and 39% of their evaluators reported that monitoring of the use of test scores to adjust programs was included in their principal evaluation. Thirty-eight percent of the elementary principals and 44% of their evaluators reported the same.
- Professional development - Seventy-one percent of the principals reported that principal inservice was available in their district; 85% of the evaluators reported the same. Twenty-seven percent of the principals and 34% of the evaluators reported that peer support groups were available.

2) Conditions of evaluation:

- Years in place - Twenty-one percent of the evaluators reported principal evaluation systems that had been in place for 3 years

or less. Twenty-five percent had been in place 4 to 5 years, and 25% had been in place 10 years or longer.

- Training - Fifty-five percent of the principals and evaluators reported some training. Intensive training was reported by 33%.
- Organization - Sixty-five percent of the high school and 73% of the elementary principals reported that some decisions were site-based within their district. High school principals in 5% and elementary principals in 4% of the districts reported that all decisions were site-based.
- Compensation - Eighteen percent of the districts tied principal evaluation to merit pay or planned to do so. Thirteen percent offered other compensation. Seventy percent offered no compensation in connection with principal evaluation.

3) Effectiveness of evaluation - Based on a 5-point Likert scale, the following means describe effectiveness of the principal as indicated by respondents:

- Evaluators of principals (4.49), and high school (4.49) and elementary (4.29) principals believe that principals can impact teaching, learning, and student achievement.
- Average ratings of the effectiveness of principal evaluation systems were as follows: evaluators, 3.67; high school principals, 3.40; elementary principals, 3.3.
- Ratings of individual facets of effectiveness of principal evaluation systems included:

Evaluators - Ability to provide accountability, 3.65; to facilitate growth, 3.79; and to impact student outcomes, 3.26.

Principals (high school) - Ability to provide accountability, 3.46; to facilitate growth, 3.53; and to impact student outcomes, 3.09.

Principals (elementary) - Ability to provide accountability, 3.39; to facilitate growth, 3.49; and to impact student outcomes, 3.07.

Relationships among constructs

Three research questions sought to determine the following: 1) the relationship between type of evaluation and perceived effectiveness, 2) the relationship between conditions of evaluation and perceived effectiveness, and 3) the relationship of size and socioeconomic status of school and district to type, conditions, and effectiveness of evaluation. Multiple regression analysis was applied to the constructs addressed in the first two questions and correlational analysis to these constructs addressed in the third question. Among the results were the following findings:

1. Relationship of type of evaluation to perceived effectiveness:
   - Evaluators - The null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level of significance. Instructional leadership and quality feedback were useful in predicting perceived effectiveness of principal evaluation, accounting for 41% of the variance among scores.

- High school principals - The null hypothesis was retained at the .05 level of significance. Upon application of analysis to data provided by high school principals, no predictors of perceived effectiveness were found to exist among the components of "type of evaluation."
- Elementary principals - The null hypothesis was retained at the .05 level of significance. Data provided by elementary principals yielded no predictors of perceived effectiveness among the components of "type of evaluation."

2) Relationship of conditions of evaluation to perceived effectiveness:
   - Evaluators - The null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level of significance. Degree of decentralization, span of control, and number of years in place were useful in predicting perceived effectiveness of principal evaluation accounting for 26% of the variance among scores.

3) Relationship of size and socioeconomic status of school and district to type, conditions, and effectiveness of evaluation:
   - Type of Evaluation - Correlations between most components of type to size and socioeconomic status of schools and districts were found to be statistically significant, but lacked sufficient magnitude to be considered of practical significance.
   - Conditions of evaluation - Correlations between most conditions to size and socioeconomic status of schools and districts were

found to be statistically significant, but lacked sufficient magnitude to be considered of practical significance. The single exception was the correlation of span of control to size of high school (.509) and size of district (.550).

- Effectiveness of evaluation - Correlations between most facets of effectiveness to size and socioeconomic status of schools and districts were found to be statistically significant, but lacked sufficient magnitude to be considered of practical significance.

## Conclusions

Analysis of the data addressing the constructs identified as type, conditions, and effectiveness led to several conclusions concerning the status of principal evaluation in the United States. Statistical analysis of these data led to conclusions concerning the relationships among the constructs used to define status. These conclusions are presented below.

### Status of principal evaluation

For purposes of this study, status of evaluation consisted of the following: 1) types of principal evaluation systems in place, including the purpose and the degree to which research-based components and supporting practices were in use within these systems; 2) the conditions under which evaluation systems were implemented, including characteristics of principals, evaluators, and evaluation systems which might impact principal evaluation; and 3) effectiveness of the evaluation system as

perceived by principals and evaluators, including the beliefs of both concerning the degree to which principals impact teaching, learning, and student achievement.

Type of evaluation Evaluators reported growth as the purpose of principal evaluation within their district; principals reported that the key purpose was accountability. Evaluators reported greater numbers of site visits and conferences than principals and more frequent use of high-quality feedback. Thirty-two percent of the principals reported no official site visits. Forty percent of the principals reported one conference a year or less. Only 33% reported at least three conferences. Most principals (71%) reported no direct observation of teacher evaluation. Sixty-six percent reported no evaluation of the use of test scores to adopt, adjust, or eliminate programs. Support for principals appears to be available in the form of district inservice for principals. However, this study made no attempt to determine the degree to which this is tied to principal evaluation. In all cases, the percent of evaluators reporting use of research-based components and supporting practices was greater than that of principals.

Conditions of evaluation Most districts reported their system had been in place 5 years or less; 27% for 3 years or less. Twenty-five percent had been in use within the district for 10 years or more. Intensive training of principals and evaluators was found in 33% of the districts. More than two-thirds of the principals reported some decision making occurred at the building level. Less than 33% of the districts tied principal evaluation to merit pay or planned to do so.

Effectiveness of evaluation Both principals and evaluators expressed strong beliefs in the ability of principals to impact teaching, learning, and student achievement. Principals expressed little confidence in the ability of the principal evaluation system to support them in providing this impact. Evaluators, although their mean scores were slightly higher than principals, also failed to express confidence in their district's principal evaluation system. Lowest confidence was expressed by both groups in the ability of principal evaluation to impact student achievement.

## Relationships among factors of principal evaluation

In addition to determining the status of principal evaluation through investigation of type, conditions, and expectations, this study also investigated relationships among these constructs and their relationship to type and size of district and school.

Relationship between effectiveness and type of system The effectiveness of the principal evaluation system as perceived by evaluators was predicted by the frequency and quality of feedback and the degree to which direct instructional leadership was included in the evaluation system.

Variance in scores of effectiveness of principal evaluation as perceived by high school principals could not be predicted by the number of research-based components that were included in the principal evaluation system. This was also true of the variance in effectiveness of principal evaluation as perceived by elementary principals.

Relationship between the effectiveness and conditions of system

Evaluators' perception of the effectiveness of their principal evaluation system could be predicted by the degree to which the district organization was decentralized, the span of control, and the length of time that the system had been in use.

Relationship of size and socioeconomic status to type, effectiveness, and conditions The following relationships of size and socioeconomic status to type, effectiveness, and conditions of principal evaluation were found to exist.

Size Size of district was believed to have a positive effect on type of evaluation and conditions under which the system was implemented and administered. It was believed that large districts would have more resources available to develop and implement an effective principal evaluation system, and a greater degree of pressure to demonstrate accountability. These expectations were not found to be true. The exception was the increase in span of control as the size of the district increased.

Socioeconomic status Socioeconomic status of the district was also believed to be positively correlated to type and conditions. In addition to more resources, expectations for excellence and accountability are generally believed to be higher in wealthy districts. Again, these expectations were not supported by this study. As with size, some relationships were statistically significant, and the relationship was too small to be of practical significance.

## Limitations of the Study

The research design used in this study resulted in the following limitations:

1. Because this study was part of an ongoing research project, states included in the sample were those having no state-mandated teacher evaluation system in 1988, when the sample was drawn.

2. Because participation was voluntary, it is possible that districts responding were those with well-developed systems of principal evaluation.

3. Although superintendents were instructed to distribute the questionnaires intended for principals to be distributed to the first high school principal and the first elementary principal on the district's alphabetical list, it is possible that these instructions were not followed.

4. Due to the placement of two response choices in isolation at the far right of the page, many respondents failed to indicate whether their system was effective or ineffective, thus eliminating an overall effectiveness measure.

5. The question concerning formative and summative evaluation was unclear, as respondents were asked to check all that applied. It is possible that respondents checked formative, summative, and both.

6. The question concerning compensation of the evaluator's questionnaire did not offer the choice "none" as an answer to performance compensation.

7. Concerning the construct of perceived effectiveness, this study deals with perceptions and does not include investigation of student outcomes or other hard data concerning effectiveness.

## Discussion

The first wave of educational reform that swept the nation during the '80s called attention to the principal as the instructional leader of the building. A result of this increased attention to the importance of the principal's role was the development of research-based, clinical supervision models of principal evaluation. Based on the setting and accomplishment of goals, these models were designed to evaluate and improve the performance of principals. The first wave of educational reform was followed closely by a second which called for nothing less than total organizational restructuring of schools at the building and district level. Research that identified productive organizational structures and change processes was applied to school districts and suggested a new role for principals. Because of their unique position in the middle level of loosely connected district organizations, principals were seen as potential links that could strengthen these organizations and impact productivity. Within this role they would support, disseminate, and strengthen district culture, provide an essential channel of continuous two-way communication within the district, and implement and evaluate district programs (Fullan, 1991).

Districts seeking to establish an effective system of principal evaluation during this period were caught between two waves of school

reform. Many districts were in the process of implementing or refining clinical supervision models designed as part of the first wave of reform, to provide professional growth and accountability for instructional leadership when the second wave of reform with new implications for the role of principals appeared on the scene. Principals were now seen by many as key players within the district's organization, impacting the ability of the district to support and enhance effective district-wide teaching and learning which would result in improved student outcomes. Thus, new demands were implied for principal evaluation when it was not yet determined whether the old demands were being met.

This current study defined the status of school principal evaluation in school districts within the United States, including the extent to which components of current research-based models had been implemented and were perceived to be effective in achieving the results for which they were designed. In addition, this study provided information concerning the potential for these components to meet the demands that will be placed on principals in the future to support restructured organizations.

Researchers responsible for the development of recent principal evaluation models stress the importance of frequent, on-task contact between evaluators and principals if growth and accountability are to occur. Of no less significance is the importance of frequent, on-task, reciprocal contact between evaluators and principals if the organization is to engage in continuous evaluation and adjustment necessary to meet the needs of students and produce outcomes demanded by the public. This

contact, to be effective, must include official and unofficial site visits, productive conferences, and quality feedback.

The current study reveals that frequent productive contact between evaluator and principal is not a reality in many school districts. One-third of the principals reported no site visits, etc. On the other hand, some principals report unofficial site visits as frequently as once a week. It should be noted these may be due to proximity of buildings and offices in small districts, and may contain little or no quality feedback. Not only do many evaluation systems currently in place fail to include the minimum contact between evaluator and principal needed to provide effective clinical evaluation, and as such are unable to impact the performance of principals, it is questionable that the amount of contact is sufficient to provide reliable accountability. Certainly this lack of contact will not allow for the principals to serve as an effective link within the district organization. It should be noted that principals and evaluators are not in agreement concerning the frequency of site visits, conferences, feedback, and other research-based components of principal evaluation. Principals report fewer occurrences of all components than do evaluators.

In addition to lack of meaningful contact between principals and their evaluators, few principals have the benefit of peer support. The problem of isolation and its potential impact on performance, as outlined by Barth and others, is still with us. Little use is made of multiple sources of input for principal evaluation, thus increasing the subjectivity of the process. It is important to note that, although the

importance of the principal as instructional leader is beyond debate, little attempt is made to directly evaluate this leadership.

In addition to defining the status of principal evaluation, the current study investigated conditions that may impact the effectiveness of principal evaluation systems. As expected, many principal evaluation systems were in the early stages of implementation. On the other end of the spectrum were districts with systems that had been in place 10 years or longer. The concern with these districts was they had not made adjustments to include new approaches to evaluation or continued training for evaluators and principals as needed. The number of districts engaging in site-based management was found to be very small. Merit pay connected to principal evaluation was found to exist or to be in the planning stages in only one-fifth of the districts.

Little research has been conducted to determine the effectiveness of principal evaluation systems currently in use. Valentine (1987) found that 85% of the superintendents responding to a survey concerning the effectiveness of the Principal Performance Evaluation mandated by the state of Missouri reported the system could be useful in improving principal performance. Ginsberg (1989) reported that "fudging" of principals when preparing documentation for principal evaluation was commonly found in South Carolina. The evaluators of the current study, many of whom were superintendents, indicated very little confidence in the ability of the principal evaluation system used in their district to provide accountability, to facilitate growth, or to impact student achievement. Even less confidence was demonstrated by principals.

These findings are in contrast to strong beliefs expressed in the current study by both principals and evaluators that principals are able to impact teaching, learning, and student outcomes. Clearly, both groups believe that principals directly or indirectly influence academic outcomes, but neither group considers principal evaluation, in their district, has the potential to support principals in doing so. Perceptions of effectiveness can be predicted in the case of evaluators by determining the degree to which they report the use of frequent quality feedback and the direct monitoring of instructional leadership. It is possible that evaluators, reporting a higher degree of some of these components, have a different vision of principal evaluation and its potential for school and district improvement. Their expectations are more closely aligned with the strong beliefs expressed by both principals and evaluators concerning the potential of principals to impact teaching, learning, and student outcomes.

It is also interesting to note that size of district is not related to the degree to which research-based components are in use within a district. The same can be said of the socioeconomic status of the district. Evaluators who reported direct monitoring of instructional leadership and frequent quality feedback perceived their principal evaluation systems to be more effective. Other research-based components of principal evaluation did not contribute to this perception. In districts where greater degrees of decentralization were found, evaluators reported greater satisfaction with their principal evaluation systems. The same is true of districts with a smaller span of control and with

principal evaluation systems that had been in place for a longer period of time.

## Recommendations for Practice

The following are recommendations for principal evaluation based on the findings of this study.

1. Seek to understand and accept the complex nature of organizations.

2. Encourage relationships between principal and evaluator built on trust and mutual expertise.

3. Devote time to building a district culture that values continual learning.

4. Investigate and implant processes that will build commitment to the principal evaluation system.

5. Adjust responsibilities and workload of evaluators to allow for quality principal evaluation including multiple site visits.

## Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the findings of this study, recommendations for further research include the following:

1. Investigate the content and quality of conferences, site visits, and other contacts between principals and evaluators.

2. Thorough investigation of types of staff development and their link to principal evaluation.

3. Investigate the perceived effectiveness of principal evaluation systems in which principals are evaluated by superintendents versus those in which principals are evaluated by central office personnel.

4. Investigate the relationship between the degree to which instructional leadership is directly evaluated and the emphasis that the district places on academic outcomes.

5. Replication of this study when principal evaluation systems across the country have been in place for a longer period of time.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

The AASA Guideline: A critical analysis. (1983). AASA, Atlantic City, New Jersey.

Anderson, M. E. (1989). Evaluating principals: Strategies to assess and enhance their performance. Oregon School Study Council Bulletin, 32(8). Eugene, OR: Oregon School Study Council.

Andrews, R. L., & Soder, R. (1987). Teacher leadership and student achievement. Educational Leadership, 44(6).

Baldridge, J. V., & Deal, T. E. (1983). The dynamics of organizational change in education. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Bamberg, J. D., & Andrews, R. L. (1990). Instructional leadership, school goals, and student achievement: Exploring the relationship between means and ends. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Research Association, Boston, Massachusetts.

Barnett, B. G. (1987). Using reflection as a professional growth activity. In W. D. Greenfield (Ed.), Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, controversies. Newton: Allyn and Bacon.

Barnett, B. G. (1990). Overcoming obstacles to peer coaching for principals. Educational Leadership, 47(8).

Barth, R. S. (1983). The head nut, reflections on school leadership. In E. Zappulla (Ed.), Evaluating administrative performance: Current trends and techniques. Belmont, CA: Star Publishing Company.

Barth, R. S. (1990). Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents, and principals can make the difference. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bennis, W. (1989). On becoming a leader. New York, NY: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row.

Blumberg, A. (1986). The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. (1980). The effective principal. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bolton, D. L. (1980). Evaluating administrative personnel in school systems. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.

Caldwell, S. D. (1986). Effective practices for principal's inservice. Theory into Practice, 25(3).

Caldwell, S. D. (1991). Integrating individual growth and organizational development. Journal of Staff Development, 12(1).

Croghan, J. H., & Lake, D. C. (1984). Competencies of effective principals and strategies for implementation. Southeastern Educational Improvement Laboratory.

Crowson, R. L., & Porter-Gehrie, C. (1987). The local school district superintendency: A puzzling administrative role. Educational Administrative Quarterly, 23(3).

Daresh, J. C., & LaPlant, J. C. (1984, April). Inservice for school administrators: A status report. Paper presented at AERA, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Deal, T. E. (1982). Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Deal, T. E. (1990). The principal's role in shaping school culture. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Deming, W. E. (1986). Out of the crises. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Center for Advanced Engineering Study.

Duke, D. L. (1990). Setting goals for professional development. Educational Leadership, 47(8).

Duke, D., & Stiggins, R. J. (1985). Evaluating the performance of principals: A descriptive study. Educational Administration Quarterly, 21(4).

Dwyer, D. C. (1985). Five principals in action: Perspectives on instructional management. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Dwyer, D. C. (1986). Understanding the principal's contribution to instruction. Peabody Journal of Education, 63(1).

Etzioni, A. (1988). The moral dimension toward a new theory of economics. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Fullan, M. G. (1991). The new meaning of educational change (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Fullan, M., Bennett, B., & Rolheiser-Bennett, C. (1990). Linking classroom and school improvement. Educational Leadership, 47(8).

Gardner, J. W. (1990). On leadership. New York: The Free Press.

Ginsberg, R. (1988). Principals as instructional leaders: An ailing panacea. Education in Urban Society, 20(7).

Ginsberg, R. (1989). Principal evaluation...a call to arms. Administrator's Notebook, 33(7).

Ginsberg, R., & Cook, N. (1988, April). Documenting principal performance: The South Carolina Principal Evaluation Program. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school: Prospectives for the future. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Goodlad, J. I., & Oakes, J. (1988). We must offer equal access to knowledge. Educational Leadership, 45(5).

Hall, G. E. (1988). The principal as leader of the change facilitating team. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 22(1).

Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. (1987). Change in schools: Facilitating the process. Albany, NY: New York State Press.

Hall, G. E., Hord, S. M., Huling, L. L., Rutherford, W. L., & Stiegelbauer, S. M. (1983). Leadership variables associated with successful school improvement. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Hallinger, P., & McCary, C. E., III. (1991). Using a problem-based approach for instructional leadership development. Journal of Staff Development, 12(2).

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. F. (1987). Assessing and developing principal instructional leadership. Educational Leadership, 44(1).

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1991). Developing leaders for tomorrow's schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 72.

Harrison, W. C., & Peterson, K. D. (1987). Complexities in the evaluation of principals: The relationship between satisfaction with the evaluation processes, criteria, and sources of information.

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1977). Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hickman, R. D. (1992). Professor and Leader, Department of Statistics, Statistical Laboratory, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. Personal interview.

Hilliard, A. (1991). Do we have the will to educate all children? Educational Leadership, 49(1).

Hodgkinson, H. (1988). The right schools for the right kids. Educational Leadership, 45(5).

Hord, S. M. (1990). Images of superintendent's leadership for learning. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Hoyle, J. R. (1987). The AASA model for preparing school leaders. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training in education. Albany, NY: University of New York Press.

Hoyle, J. R., English, F., & Steffy, B. (1985). Skills for successful school leaders. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators Press.

Joyce, B. R., & Showers, B. (1988). Student achievement through staff development. New York, NY: Longman.

Kimbrough, R. B., & Burkett, C. W. (1990). The principalship: Concepts and practices. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

LaRocque, L., & Coleman, P. (1989). Quality control: School accountability and district ethos. In M. Holmes, K. Leithwood, & D. Musella (Eds.), Educational policy for effective schools. Toronto: OISE Press.

Larsen, T. J. (1987, April). Identification of instructional leadership behaviors and the impact of their implementation on academic achievement. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC. (ERIC ED 281 286)

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1990). Transformational leadership: How principals help with reform of school culture. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Leplant, J. C. (1987). Facilitating I/D/E/A principal's collegial support groups as a means of professional development and school

improvement. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training in education. Albany, NY: University of New York Press.

Levine, S. L. (1987). Promoting adult growth in schools: The promise of professional development. New York, NY: Allyn & Bacon.

Levine, S. L., Barth, R. S., & Haskins, K. W. (1987). The Harvard principals center: School leaders as adult learners. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training in education. Albany, NY: University of New York Press.

Lieberman, A. (1989). Expanding the leadership team. Educational Leadership, 45(5).

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1984). Teachers, their world and their work. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lightfoot, S. (1983). The good high school: Portraits of character and culture. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Look, E., & Manatt, R. P. (1983). Performance criteria for the evaluation of school principals and headmasters. Occasional Paper No. 83-4, SIM. College of Education, Iowa State University.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Loucks-Horsley, S., & Hergert, L. F. (1985). An action guide to school improvement. Arlington, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and The Network.

Louis, K. (1989). The role of the school district in school improvement. In M. Holmes, K. Leithwood, & D. Musella (Eds.), Educational policy for effective schools. Toronto: OISE Press.

Louis, K., & Miles, M. B. (1990). Improving the urban high school: What works and why. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Manasse, L. A. (1985). Improving conditions for principal effectiveness: Policy implications for research. The Elementary School Journal, 85.

Manatt, R. P. (1988). Evaluating and improving administrator behavior (Developmental materials for AASA/NASE Video Series, D. E. Nelson, Ed.). Ames, IA: Iowa State University, College of Education, School Improvement Model.

Manatt, R. P. (1989). Principal evaluation is largely wrongheaded and ineffective. The Executive Educator, 47(10).

Manatt, R. P., & Stow, S. B. (1982). Administrator evaluation tailored to your district or independent school. Educational Leadership, 39(5).

McCleary, L. (1979). Evaluation of principals. Theory into practice, 28(1).

Miles, M. B., & Louis, K. S. (1990). Mustering the will and skill for change. Educational Leadership, 47(8).

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1987). New directions in the professional development of school administrators: A synthesis and suggestions for improvement. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training in education. Albany, NY: University of New York Press.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., & Peterson, K. D. (1985). Supervising and evaluating principals: Lessons from effective districts. Educational Leadership, 43(2).

National Association of Elementary School Principals. (1986). Proficiencies for principals. Alexandria, VA: NAESP.

Ouchi, W. G. (1981). Theory Z. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

PC CARP. (1986). Fuller, W. A., Kennedy, W., Schnell, D., Sullivan, G., & Park, H. J. Statistical Laboratory, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

Peters, S., & Bagenstos, N. T. (1988, April). State-mandated principal evaluation: A report on current practices. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Research Association.

Peters, T. J., & Austin, N. (1984). A passion for excellence: The leadership difference. New York, NY: Random House.

Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H., Jr. (1982). In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies. New York, NY: Harper.

Petrone, J. M. (1990). Teacher performance evaluation: A nationwide status report of type, content and duration of training for public school teachers.

Pitner, N. J. (1987). Principles of quality staff development: Lessons for administrator training. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training in education. Albany, NY: University of New York Press.

Redfern, G. B. (1983). Evaluating middle-management personnel. In E. Zappulla (Ed.), Evaluation administrative performance: Current trends and techniques. Belmont, CA: Star Publishing Co.

Rosenholtz, S. (1989). Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools. New York: Longman.

Rutherford, W. L. (1985). School principals as effective leaders. Phi Delta Kappan, 67.

Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., & Smith, A. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sarason, S. (1971). The culture of school and the problem of change. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Schein, E. H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schon, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Schon, D. A. (1984). Leadership as reflection in action. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), Leadership and organizational culture. Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Schon, D. A. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Senge, P. M. (1991). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York: Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1991). The principalship (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (1988). Supervision: Human perspectives (4th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Silver, P. F. (1987). The center for advancing principalship excellence (APEX) and approach to professionalizing educational administration. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training in education. Albany, NY: University of New York Press.

Smith, W. F., & Andrews, R. L. (1988). Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Spady, William. (1989). Applying the power and principles of outcome-based education in your schools. Annual conference of the Minnesota Association of School Administrators, Brainerd, Minnesota.

Sweeney, J. (1982). Research synthesis on effective school leadership. Educational Leadership, 72(5).

Vaill, P. B. (1984). The purposing of high performing systems. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), Leadership and organizational culture. Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Valentine, J. W. (1987). Performance/outcome based principal evaluation. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Association of School Administrators, New Orleans. (ERIC ED 281 317)

Van der Vegt, R., & Knit, H. (1988). The role of the principal in school improvement: Steering functions for implementation at the school level. Journal of Research Development in Education.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21(2).

Weick, K. E. (1982). Administering education in loosely coupled schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 27(2).

Weiss, K. G. (1988). Evaluation of elementary and secondary school principals' performance (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1987). Dissertations Abstracts International, 49, 08A.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is with sincere appreciation that I acknowledge those who have contributed to the successful completion of this research:

Sarah and Andrew Frerking, who have encouraged me through my master's and specialist degrees and have willingly undertaken the financing of their own undergraduate education in order that I may complete my Ph.D.

Dorothy Bultemeier, who provided an excellent role model, successfully balancing a professional career in the service of others while supporting and guiding the development of her own family and who encouraged me throughout the completion of this degree.

Dr. Richard Manatt, whose guidance and expertise throughout this project and willingness to adjust his schedule when needed have made possible the successful completion of this degree.

The remaining members of my committee, Dr. Jacqueline Mitchell, Dr. Charles Mulford, Dr. Anton Netusil, and Dr. Shirley Stow, whose guidance and assistance helped to ensure the validity and quality of this project.

Teri Black, whose patience and perseverance provided for timely and accurate collection of data.

Bonnie Trede, whose expertise as typist and consultant made it possible to complete this dissertation.

# APPENDIX A.

# LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

SIM Projects
College of Education
Iowa State University
E005 Lagomarcino Hall
Ames, Iowa 50011
(515) 294-5521



School Improvement Model
Dick Manatt
Director
Shirley Stow
Co-Director
Katy Rice
Program Assistant

Dear Superintendent,

Your district has been selected to be included in a research project that will identify expectations held by school districts concerning their principals, and investigate systems used to evaluate principal performance. Each district in this sample has been chosen to represent one segment of the 15,000 school districts in the United States. Realizing that many demands are made on your time, we appreciate your cooperation in helping us to gather information that will be of great value to us in the training of future school administrators. The three questionnaires enclosed are designed to be completed in ten minutes, and each comes with a stamped envelope.

If your district is not evaluating principals at this time, you will find that the questionnaires also contain sections which refer to expectations. If completed, these will provide us with valuable information and help us to build an accurate picture of what is expected of principals. It is important that all questionnaires are returned, as each district represents a segment of the total population.

The BLUE questionnaire should be completed by an evaluator of principals.

The YELLOW questionnaire should be completed by the high school principal who is first on your district's alphabetical list.

The GREEN questionnaire should be completed by the elementary principal who is first on your district's alphabetical list.

The questionnaires should be returned immediately to facilitate processing of all responses. The results of this study will be mailed to all districts returning questionnaires.

This research is part of an on-going study conducted by Dr. Richard Manatt and the School Improvement Model of Iowa State University. Your cooperation will help to determine current practices and identify ways in which we may be of help to schools in the future.

Be assured that the anonymity of responses will be preserved. No individual responses will be reported. Please contact me if you have further questions or concerns. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Ruth Frerking
Research Associate
Iowa State University
(515) 294 2799

# APPENDIX B.

# SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

# SURVEY OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS

SIM - School Improvement Model Iowa State University
© Ruth A. Frerking (515) 294 2799


## I. EVALUATOR OF PRINCIPALS

A. What title best describes your position? __ superintendent __ central office
B. Years in present position in this district: ___ Years experience as principal evaluator ___
C. Age : __ 25-29 __ 30-34 __ 35-39 __ 40-44 __ 45-49 __ 50-54 __ 55-59 __ 60+
D. Gender: __ male __ female

## II. TYPE OF DISTRICT

A. Student enrollment: _____ district number of principals in district: _____
B. Type of community: ___ rural ___ urban ___ suburban
C. In what state is your district located? _____
D. Economic status: _____ cost per pupil (operating budget / # of students) ____ % free and red. lunch (district)
E. How would you describe the organization of your district? ___ centralized ___ some site-based decisions
___ all site-based decisions

## III. EFFECTIVENESS OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION

Does this district evaluate principals?
__ yes If yes is checked, please complete all sections of the questionnaire.
How effective is the district's principal evaluation system? __ effective __ ineffective
__ no If no is checked, please complete all BUT the sections marked with an asterick. * (IV., V. & VI.)

## * IV. TYPE OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION

PART ONE : Which best describe the type of principal evaluation in your district? (CHECK ONE)

A. KEY purpose: __ termination __ accountability __ merit pay __ promotion __ growth
B. Evaluations are conducted: __ never __ weekly __ monthly __ annual __ 2 or 3 yrs
C. Site visits (official): __ none __ annually __ monthly __ weekly
D. Site visits (unofficial): __ none __ annually __ monthly __ weekly
E. Conferences occur: __ never __ one a yr. __ two a yr. __ three or more a yr.
F. Feedback received: __ none __ some __ frequent
G. Goals established for principal
(as part of evaluation process): __ none __ set by evaluator __ set by principal __ set by both

PART TWO: Which best describe the type of principal evaluation in your district? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

A. Purposes include: __ termination __ accountability __ merit pay __ promotion __ growth
B. Site visits include: __ conversation __ shadowing __ conferencing __ formal observations
C. Feedback: __ unclear __ specific __ helpful __ goal-related
D. Type of conference: __ formative __ summative __ both
E. Formal input from: __ supervisor __ peers __ teachers __ students __ parents __ portfolio
F. Goal-setting in the principal evaluation process includes:
__ personal goals __ professional goals __ building goals __ district goals

G. Professional development: (district) __ none available __ administrator inservice __ peer support group
(other) __ university courses __ professional workshops __ conferences

H. Site visits include: __ no observation of teacher evaluation
__ observation of principal conducting classroom observation of teacher
__ observation of principal conducting post/observation conference with teacher

I. Criteria used to evaluate principals include monitoring of curriculum in the following areas:
__ none __ delivery __ alignment __ test disaggregation __ use of test scores to adjust programs

## * V. CONDITIONS OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION

A. Your experience with this system of evaluation: __ none __ 1-2 yrs __ 3-5 yrs __ 6-9 yrs __ 10+
B. Evaluation training of supervisor: __ none __ very little __ some __ intensive
C. Evaluation training of principal: __ none __ very little __ some __ intensive
D. The principal evaluation system was developed: __ by the state __ by the district __ with principal input
E. The system has been in place: __ 1 yr __ 2-3 yrs __ 4-5 yrs __ 6-7 yrs __ 8-9 yrs __ 10 + yrs

F. Number of principals you evaluate: __ 1-5 __ 6-10 __ 11-15 __ 16-20 __ 21-25 __ 26-30 __ 30
G. Percent of time spent on principal evaluation: ___
H. Performance compensation: __ merit pay in place __ considering merit pay __ other __ none



## * VI. EFFECTIVENESS OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION

**1 strongly disagree 2 disagree 3 neutral 4 agree 5 strongly agree**

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. | This system is effective in measuring actual principal behavior. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. | This system is effective in identifying problems. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. | This system is effective in fostering growth. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. | This system is effective in fostering student achievement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| E. | This system is a valid reflection of daily responsibilities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| F. | This system reflects what the district expects of principals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| G. | This system is effective in improving principal performance. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| H. | This system effectively increases principal/supervisor communication. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I. | This system is effective in monitoring accountability. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

What is the greatest drawback to effective principal evaluation in this district? (CHECK ONE)

A. ___ time
B. ___ workload of evaluator
C. ___ training of evaluator
D. ___ criteria is are unclear
E. ___ too subjective
F. ___ (other - please list)

What are other drawbacks to effective principal evaluation? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

A. ___ time
B. ___ workload of evaluator
C. ___ training of evaluator
D. ___ criteria is unclear
E. ___ too subjective
F. ___ (other - please list)

## VII. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND EVALUATION

**1 strongly disagree 2 disagree 3 neutral 4 agree 5 strongly agree**

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. | In this district the key responsibility of the principal is the improvement of teaching and learning within the building. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. | This district is interested in the growth and professional renewal of principals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. | Administrators (other than principals) in this district are interested in growing professionally and continuing to learn. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. | In order to be effective, principal evaluation systems must be linked to staff development opportunities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| E. | In order to be effective, principal evaluation systems must be linked to some type of incentive. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| F. | Effective evaluation of all personnel, including central office administrators and superintendents, is necessary for district-wide school improvement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| G. | Evaluation of school board members is necessary for district-wide school improvement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

## VIII. DIMENSIONS OF PRINCIPALSHIP

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. | A building principal is able to influence the academic outcomes of a school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. | The successful implementation of district programs rests with building principals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. | Principals are able to improve the climate of a building. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. | Principals are able to influence the values / beliefs of teachers concerning teaching and learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| E. | Principals are able to improve the quality of teaching in the building. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| F. | When problems arise, I am able to assist principals in improving teaching and learning in their building. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| G. | When problems arise, I am able to assist principals with the impacting of teacher values and beliefs. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| H. | When problems arise, I am able to assist principals in successfully implementing district programs. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

# SURVEY OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS

SIM - School Improvement Model Iowa State University
© Ruth A. Frerking (515) 294 2799


## I. SECONDARY PRINCIPAL

A. Years of experience as principal in current building: ___ Total years as principal: ___
B. Age : __ 25-29 __ 30-34 __ 35-39 __ 40-44 __ 45-49 __ 50-54 __ 55-59 __ 60+
C. Gender: __ male __ female

## II. TYPE OF SCHOOL

A. Student enrollment : _____ building
B. Type of community: ___ rural ___ urban ___ suburban
C. In what state is your district located? _____
D. Building level : __ high school __ junior high / middle school __ elementary
E. Economic status: ___ % free or reduced lunch in building
F. How would you describe the organization of your district? ___ centralized ___ some site-based decisions
___ all site-based decisions

## III. EFFECTIVENESS OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION

Does this district evaluate principals?
__ yes If yes is checked, please complete all sections of the questionnaire.
How effective is the district's principal evaluation system? __ effective __ ineffective
__ no If no is checked, please complete all BUT the sections marked with an asterick. * (IV., V. & VI.)

## * IV. TYPE OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION

PART ONE : Which best describe the type of principal evaluation in your district? (CHECK ONE)

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. KEY purpose: | __ termination | __ accountability | __ merit pay | __ promotion | __ growth |
| B. Evaluations are conducted: | __ never | __ weekly | __ monthly | __ annual | __ 2 or 3 yrs |
| C. Site visits (official): | __ none | __ annually | __ monthly | __ weekly | |
| D. Site visits (unofficial): | __ none | __ annually | __ monthly | __ weekly | |
| E. Conferences occur: | __ never | __ one a yr. | __ two a yr. | __ three or more a yr. | |
| F. Feedback received: | __ none | __ some | __ frequent | | |

G. Goals established for principal (as part of evaluation process): __ none __ set by evaluator __ set by principal __ set by both

PART TWO: Which best describe the type of principal evaluation in your district? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

A. Purposes include: __ termination __ accountability __ merit pay __ promotion __ growth
B. Site visits include: __ conversation __ shadowing __ conferencing __ formal observations
C. Feedback: __ unclear __ specific __ helpful __ goal-related
D. Type of conference: __ formative __ summative __ both
E. Formal input from: __ supervisor __ peers __ teachers __ students __ parents __ portfolio
F. Goal-setting in the principal evaluation process includes:
__ personal goals __ professional goals __ building goals __ district goals

G. Professional development: (district) __ none available __ administrator inservice __ peer support group
(other) __ university courses __ professional workshops __ conferences

H. Site visits include: __ no observation of teacher evaluation
__ observation of principal conducting classroom observation of teacher
__ observation of principal conducting post/observation conference with teacher

I. Criteria used to evaluate principals include monitoring of curriculum in the following areas:
__ none __ delivery __ alignment __ test disaggregation __ use of test scores to adjust programs

## * V. CONDITIONS OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION

A. Your experience with this system of evaluation: __ none __ 1-2 yrs __ 3-5 yrs __ 6-9 yrs __ 10+
B. Evaluation training of supervisor: __ none __ very little __ some __ intensive

C. Evaluation training of principal: __ none __ very little __ some __ intensive
D. The principal evaluation system was developed: __ by the state __ by the district __ with principal input
E. The system has been in place: __ 1 yr __ 2-3 yrs __ 4-5 yrs __ 6-7 yrs __ 8-9 yrs __ 10 + yrs
F. Performance compensation: __ merit pay in place __ considering merit pay ___ other __ none



## * VI. EFFECTIVENESS OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION

**1 strongly disagree 2 disagree 3 neutral 4 agree 5 strongly agree**

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. | This system is effective in measuring actual principal behavior. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. | This system is effective in identifying problems. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. | This system is effective in fostering growth. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. | This system is effective in fostering student achievement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| E. | This system is a valid reflection of daily responsibilities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| F. | This system reflects what the district expects of principals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| G. | This system is effective in improving principal performance. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| H. | This system increases principal/supervisor communication. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I. | This system is effective in monitoring accountability. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

What is the greatest drawback to effective principal evaluation in this district? (CHECK ONE)

A. ___ time
B. ___ workload of evaluator
C. ___ training of evaluator
D. ___ criteria are unclear
E. ___ too subjective
F. ___ (other - please list)

What are other drawbacks to effective principal evaluation? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

A. ___ time
B. ___ workload of evaluator
C. ___ training of evaluator
D. ___ criteria is unclear
E. ___ too subjective
F. ___ (other - please list)

## VII. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND EVALUATION

**1 strongly disagree 2 disagree 3 neutral 4 agree 5 strongly agree**

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. | In this district the key responsibility of the principal is the improvement of teaching and learning within the building. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. | This district is interested in the growth and professional renewal of principals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. | Administrators (other than principals) in this district are interested in growing professionally and continuing to learn. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. | In order to be effective, principal evaluation systems must be linked to staff development opportunities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| E. | In order to be effective, principal evaluation systems must be linked to some type of incentive. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| F. | Effective evaluation of all personnel, including central office administrators and superintendents is necessary for district-wide school improvement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| G. | Evaluation of school board members is necessary for district-wide school improvement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

## VIII. DIMENSIONS OF PRINCIPALSHIP

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. | A building principal is able to influence the academic outcomes of a building. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. | The successful implementation of district programs rests with building principals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. | Principals are able to improve the climate of a building. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. | Principals are able to influence the values / beliefs of teachers concerning teaching and learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| E. | Principals are able to improve the quality of teaching in the building. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| F. | I am able to improve teaching and learning in this building. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| G. | I am able to impact the values and beliefs of teachers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| H. | I am able to successfully implement district programs. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

# SURVEY OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS

SIM - School Improvement Model Iowa State University
© Ruth A. Frerking (515) 294 2799



## I. ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL

A. Years of experience as principal in current building: ___ Total years as principal: ___
B. Age : __ 25-29 __ 30-34 __ 35-39 __ 40-44 __ 45-49 __ 50-54 __ 55-59 __ 60+
C. Gender: __ male __ female

## II. TYPE OF SCHOOL

A. Student enrollment : _____ building
B. Type of community: ___ rural ___ urban ___ suburban
C. In what state is your district located? _____
D. Building level : __ high school __ junior high / middle school __ elementary
E. Economic status: ___ % free or reduced lunch in building
F. How would you describe the organization of your district? ___ centralized ___ some site-based decisions
___ all site-based decisions

## III. EFFECTIVENESS OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION

Does this district evaluate principals?

__ yes If yes is checked, please complete all sections of the questionnaire.
How effective is the district's principal evaluation system? __ effective __ ineffective

__ no If no is checked, please complete all BUT the sections marked with an asterick. * (IV., V. & VI.)

## * IV. TYPE OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION

PART ONE : Which best describe the type of principal evaluation in your district? (CHECK ONE)

A. KEY purpose: __ termination __ accountability __ merit pay __ promotion __ growth
B. Evaluations are conducted: __ never __ weekly __ monthly __ annual __ 2 or 3 yrs
C. Site visits (official): __ none __ annually __ monthly __ weekly
D. Site visits (unofficial): __ none __ annually __ monthly __ weekly
E. Conferences occur: __ never __ one a yr. __ two a yr. __ three or more a yr.
F. Feedback received: __ none __ some __ frequent
G. Goals established for principal
(as part of evaluation process): __ none __ set by evaluator __ set by principal __ set by both

PART TWO: Which best describe the type of principal evaluation in your district? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

A. Purposes include: __ termination __ accountability __ merit pay __ promotion __ growth
B. Site visits include: __ conversation __ shadowing __ conferencing __ formal observations
C. Feedback: __ unclear __ specific __ helpful __ goal-related
D. Type of conference: __ formative __ summative __ both
E. Formal input from: __ supervisor __ peers __ teachers __ students __ parents __ portfolio
F. Goal-setting in the principal evaluation process includes:
__ personal goals __ professional goals __ building goals __ district goals

G. Professional development: (district) __ none available __ administrator inservice __ peer support group
(other) __ university courses __ professional workshops __ conferences

H. Site visits include: __ no observation of teacher evaluation
__ observation of principal conducting classroom observation of teacher
__ observation of principal conducting post/observation conference with teacher

I. Criteria used to evaluate principals include monitoring of curriculum in the following areas:
__ none __ delivery __ alignment __ test disaggregation __ use of test scores to adjust programs

## * V. CONDITIONS OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION

A. Your experience with this system of evaluation: __ none __ 1-2 yrs __ 3-5 yrs __ 6-9 yrs __ 10+
B. Evaluation training of supervisor: __ none __ very little __ some __ intensive

C. Evaluation training of principal: __ none __ very little __ some __ intensive
D. The principal evaluation system was developed: __ by the state __ by the district __ with principal input
E. The system has been in place: __ 1 yr __ 2-3 yrs __ 4-5 yrs __ 6-7 yrs __ 8-9 yrs __ 10 + yrs
F. Performance compensation: __ merit pay in place __ considering merit pay ___ other __ none



## * VI. EFFECTIVENESS OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION

| | **1 strongly disagree 2 disagree 3 neutral 4 agree 5 strongly agree** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. | This system is effective in measuring actual principal behavior. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. | This system is effective in identifying problems. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. | This system is effective in fostering growth. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. | This system is effective in fostering student achievement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| E. | This system is a valid reflection of daily responsibilities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| F. | This system reflects what the district expects of principals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| G. | This system is effective in improving principal performance. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| H. | This system increases principal/supervisor communication. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I. | This system is effective in monitoring accountability. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

What is the greatest drawback to effective principal evaluation in this district? (CHECK ONE)

A. ___ time
B. ___ workload of evaluator
C. ___ training of evaluator
D. ___ criteria are unclear
E. ___ too subjective
F. ___ (other - please list)

What are other drawbacks to effective principal evaluation? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

A. ___ time
B. ___ workload of evaluator
C. ___ training of evaluator
D. ___ criteria is unclear
E. ___ too subjective
F. ___ (other - please list)

## VII. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND EVALUATION

| | **1 strongly disagree 2 disagree 3 neutral 4 agree 5 strongly agree** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. | In this district the key responsibility of the principal is the improvement of teaching and learning within the building. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. | This district is interested in the growth and professional renewal of principals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. | Administrators (other than principals) in this district are interested in growing professionally and continuing to learn. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. | In order to be effective, principal evaluation systems must be linked to staff development opportunities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| E. | In order to be effective, principal evaluation systems must be linked to some type of incentive. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| F. | Effective evaluation of all personnel, including central office administrators and superintendents is necessary for district-wide school improvement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| G. | Evaluation of school board members is necessary for district-wide school improvement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

## VIII. DIMENSIONS OF PRINCIPALSHIP

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. | A building principal is able to influence the academic outcomes of a building. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. | The successful implementation of district programs rests with building principals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. | Principals are able to improve the climate of a building. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. | Principals are able to influence the values / beliefs of teachers concerning teaching and learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| E. | Principals are able to improve the quality of teaching in the building. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| F. | I am able to improve teaching and learning in this building. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| G. | I am able to impact the values and beliefs of teachers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| H. | I am able to successfully implement district programs. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

# APPENDIX C.

## INSERT FOR FOLLOW-UP MAILING

TO: THE SUPERINTENDENT

FROM: Ruth Frerking
Department of Professional Studies
Iowa State University

We are enclosing a second copy of all materials needed to furnish us with information concerning district expectations of principals and the system that your district uses to evaluate principals. The survey takes ten minutes to complete. Realizing the many demands that are made on your time, we appreciate your help in providing us with this valuable information. We ask that you route the questionnaires to the appropriate administrators in your district. It is important that we also receive replies from districts that do not have principal evaluation systems at this time.

# APPENDIX D.

## BELIEFS OF PRINCIPALS AND EVALUATORS CONCERNING GROWTH AND EVALUATION WITHIN THEIR DISTRICT

Table D.1. Beliefs of principals and evaluators concerning growth and evaluation within their district

| Beliefs | Principal evaluator (N=9281) Mean[a] | S.D. | High school principal (N=9254) Mean[a] | S.D. | Elementary principal (N=9228) Mean[a] | S.D. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **In this district:** | | | | | | |
| Principal's key responsibility is improvement of teaching and learning. | 4.37 | .80 | 3.81 | .95 | 4.01 | .90 |
| Interest exists in the growth and professional renewal of principals. | 4.21 | .73 | 3.69 | 1.11 | 3.81 | 1.23 |
| Administrators other than principals are interested in growing professionally and continuing to learn. | 4.24 | .71 | 3.86 | .89 | 4.03 | 1.04 |
| **In order to be effective:** | | | | | | |
| Principal evaluation systems must be linked to staff development. | 4.02 | .85 | 3.86 | .87 | 4.07 | .94 |
| Principal evaluation systems must be linked to some type of incentive. | 3.07 | 1.07 | 3.35 | 1.15 | 3.09 | 1.09 |
| **Successful district-wide improvement requires that:** | | | | | | |
| All personnel, including superintendents and central office administrators, be evaluated. | 4.32 | .82 | 4.29 | .78 | 4.27 | .81 |
| School board members be evaluated. | 3.68 | 1.12 | 3.83 | 1.08 | 3.71 | 1.10 |

[a]1=Strongly disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly agree.